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East Portland, as defined by this project, is located East of 82nd Avenue and Interstate 205. Right to Place Collaborative honors the Indigenous peoples whose land is represented in this work: The Clackamas, Confederated Tribes of Grande Ronde, Cascades, Cowlitz, Kalapuya, Atfalati, and the many other Indigenous nations of this area.

For these communities, this space is ancestral and has been for generations. Aggressive colonization of the region has been forced upon them for over 500 years, becoming institutionalized in 1830 with the passage of the Indian Removal Act. This federal action and many subsequent actions violently forced these communities from their rightful land to make way for white settlement; countless people were massacred in the name of the white supremacist notion of “Manifest Destiny.” Broken treaties based on empty promises and lies abolished many tribal governments in Oregon and formalized state-sanctioned, theft of land and livelihood well into the twentieth century.

Today, Portland is home to the United State’s ninth largest urban Indigenous population—estimated at nearly 60,000 people representing more than 380 tribal affiliations. The inter-tribal community is working together to find new ways to reconnect to its land and its cultures. And, the right to tribal sovereignty has been reaffirmed—beyond the Constitutional recognition of tribal nations—through recent Supreme Court decisions.

As future planners, we acknowledge the role that our field has played—and continues to play—in state-sanctioned violence against Indigenous peoples. We commit ourselves to continued learning, reflection, and action in our work to support the redistribution of power to right these historic—and perpetuated—wrongs of colonialism and white supremacy. We are also dedicated to the deeper understanding and support of Indigenous communities’ rights to sovereignty and self determination.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Team</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing + Operationalizing Equity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide to the Document</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1: Introduction + Project Background</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2: Site Selection Process</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3: Existing Conditions + Site Analysis</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4: Public + Interagency Engagement</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5: Case Studies</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6: Project Discussion: Opportunities + Challenges</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7: Recommendations</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8: Project Limitations</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In March of 2020, public life would undergo a major transformation as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Cities throughout the U.S. were grappling with the impacts to their business communities, their local economies, and urban life as indoor places became vectors for disease. As a result of the decline in economic activity, there was a dramatic reduction in automobile use—opening up an opportunity to rethink how paved surfaces, specifically parking space and streets. It encouraged many localities to quickly close down streets and reclaim them for business activity. Adapting space that had been designed to move traffic for more pedestrian and public uses was not a new concept, but the pandemic provided the opportunity for swift and experimental activity.

For many places, programs designed to reuse street space were seen as success stories, popular with the public and business communities alike; they provided a sense of hope and community while we grappled with hardship and collective isolation. However, by the fall of 2020, after months of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) communities grappling with the disparate effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, a more critical perspective emerged and cities including Portland had to answer to the fact that these programs did not support everyone, and were primarily benefiting white areas where businesses had access to capital and favorable infrastructure. Concerns about who was being left out and how the planning community could do a better job addressing racial inequities became of critical importance.

In winter term of 2021, our Portland State University Workshop team—Right to Place Collaborative (R2P)—was formed and in partnership with the Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS), we sought to better understand how off-street parking space could accommodate economic activity in East Portland, the city’s most economically and racially diverse neighborhood. We knew this was no small undertaking and that to understand the nuances, opportunities, and challenges we would need to narrow our focus and set some parameters. East Portland is a large area with different neighborhood centers that have diverse and varying demographics, business communities, non-governmental organization (NGO) support, and physical conditions. We decided to focus on two different neighborhoods based on equity considerations and interest, landing on the Rosewood and the Jade Districts; the goal was to better understand these areas with granularity but also to juxtapose them looking for similarities and differences that could guide our recommendations for using parking spaces and serving the community.

This project was exploratory in nature. Our research questions and resulting deliverables were dynamic. Through a series of conversations with City agencies including the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT), Neighborhood Prosperity Initiative (NPI) districts, and community markets paired with site analyses and case studies, we were able to form recommendations about how we think East Portland could be better served by the City of Portland. What we discovered is that implementing these programs often comes down to the issue of positive versus negative liberty; what are people capable of doing versus what they are allowed to do?

We learned the City has to go beyond providing space and that programmatic support including logistical and economic assistance is just as important—if not more important. We also learned that the success of outdoor economic activity is complicated and nuanced; these types of projects—along with the varying levels of government involvement required—makes things complicated. We observed, too, that investments need to be made to the physical conditions of these areas to support walkability, accessibility, and placemaking. We also discovered that there are many entrepreneurial actors in Portland who are already doing much of this important work and that the city does not necessarily need to reinvent the wheel. Instead, it must continue to grow in its ability to support these people in their efforts and make it easier for them to do their work.
CONSULTING TEAM
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Collage made from images by R2P of Rosewood and The Jade District.
R2P was committed to the centering of equity in every step of the process in developing this report. Utilizing guidance from the American Planning Association, the team utilized an “equity in all policies approach” from scoping to research to public outreach and to recommendations. By “equity,” we mean looking at solutions to identified problems through the broad objective that all people should have “access to the resources and opportunities necessary to improve the quality of their lives, and differences of life outcomes cannot be predicted based on race, class, or other dimensions of identity.” While different dimensions have been factored into our process as much as possible—including immigration status, disability status, and socioeconomic status—we have led with race because racism is ingrained within the systems and institutions of which we are part of and in which we operate.

By leading with race explicitly—though by no means exclusively—we mean that we begin with a consideration of racial inequities first. We do this because of the deep racial disparities that persist in virtually every indicator in the United States and because, when looking at those other dimensions of identity listed above, there are still inequities based on race. The understanding of this allows us to consider these dimensions as they intersect—while always naming the role that race plays in outcomes and experiences.

**FIGURE 1. LEADING WITH RACE WITH AN INTERSECTIONAL APPROACH**

Through the process, we identified two key challenges to equitable research and engagement that we worked to address with actionable solutions:

**Access to information:** Demographic and quantitative data ages and often lacks reputable significance at scales small enough to consider the needs and realities of members of the community we were working within; it also often lacks the richness of the varied, complex, and intersectional experiences of people. To address this, the team has embraced—in addition to quantitative data—qualitative stories and conceptual frameworks to help us better understand the communities in our chosen geographies and the issues that impact them. In doing so, we have worked to center the expertise of communities in their own lives.

**Time and resources:** Equitable engagement requires a thoughtful approach to working with communities, meaning time and resources are needed. While the team has been committed to bringing high-quality research to the table, the limitations of the project timeline meant that we could only pursue a limited amount of research and conversations with community members. This is especially true given the challenges of engagement during COVID-19 restrictions and social distancing. As a result, we have worked to focus on quality over quantity in our engagement process.
GUIDE TO THE DOCUMENT

The intended audience for this report is the City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability and adjacent City agencies. However, it is the goal of R2P that the report is presented in an approachable and useful way so that community members and community-based organizations (CBOs) can utilize our work to further their specific visions, needs, and goals both within and beyond current systems.

Parking Spaces to People Places is organized as follows:

Chapter 1: Introduction and Project Background overviews the project purpose and objectives. The chapter outlines the background and context in order to situate the project with an overview of the impetus for its development. It also situates the work within existing policies and plans at the local level.

Chapter 2: Site Selection Process overviews the steps we took to hone in on two smaller geographies to focus our analysis on in East Portland—Rosewood and the Jade District.

Chapter 3: Existing Conditions + Site Analysis describes the demographic and physical conditions of both the Jade District and Rosewood, the project’s two study areas. It also overviews land use and parcel activity through field analysis.

Chapter 4: Public & Interagency Engagement overviews the purpose and methods utilized in the engagement process. It summarizes the interviews we conducted with highlights and takeaways from conversations with community stakeholders, CBOs, market operators, and technical assistants at the City of Portland.

Chapter 5: Case Studies overviews the approach that R2P has taken in researching interesting practices in street reallocation and low-barrier market creation, with a focus on those both within Portland and outside of euro-centric models. The cases are summarized with consideration of their applicability to the East Portland context.

Chapter 6: Project Discussion: Opportunities + Challenges outlines opportunities identified through our work as they apply to potential outdoor activity, markets, and placemaking. The chapter then considers opportunity sites identified through site analysis. These opportunities are juxtaposed against challenges synthesized from all preceding sections.

Chapter 7: Recommendations overviews key strategies the project team recommends toward advancing the opportunities identified while lowering discovered barriers. They are organized based on their ability to fulfill the project’s objectives (from Chapter 1).

Chapter 8: Project Limitations considers the challenges faced by R2P during the work process, with consideration of COVID-19 and reflection on our status as students.

Appendices document the project methodology; a detailed overview of the demographic conditions of East Portland; the site selection methodology and maps; supplemental maps related to the project and planning process; a list of businesses and maps in Rosewood; and the engagement plan, interview summaries, and call logs from the engagement process.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION + PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Introduction and Project Background overviews the project purpose and objectives. The chapter outlines the background and context in order to situate the project with an overview of the impetus for its development. It also situates the work within existing policies and plans at the local level and describes the project geography selection process.

Chapter Outline:

- Purpose
- Key Takeaways from Recommendations
- Background + Context
  - Background
  - COVID-19
  - Root Shock
  - Political Representation + Capital
  - East Portland Demographics
- Policy Alignment + Existing Planning Efforts
  - The Portland Plan
  - Portland 2035 Comprehensive Plan
  - Portland Livable Streets Strategy
  - East Portland Action Plan
  - PAALF People’s Plan: East Portland Pilot
  - Regulating Parking Lots

Image by R2P of Rosewood Village Square Plaza
PURPOSE

Building upon the momentum of—and the inequities both within and highlighted by—the growing slow streets movement in the face of COVID-19, Parking Spaces to People Places (PSPP) is a project aimed at exploring the possibility of repurposing parking lots in East Portland for commercial and community space during the pandemic and beyond.

This exploration is based upon the lack of success of street and parking space reallocation for business adaptation in Portland’s most diverse district. During the rollout of the Healthy Businesses Permit program the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) expanded the option for businesses to use the right of way in the face of the pandemic. Despite some targeted outreach regarding the program and opportunities for some assistance, its lack of utilization in East Portland implies that there are barriers beyond permit navigation or knowledge of the program that have kept area businesses from broadly participating.

R2P and BPS came to the project with the understanding that COVID-19 impacted BIPOC, immigrant, and low-income Portlanders (and East Portlanders more broadly) most disparately in virtually every metric. This paired with the equity considerations above has led us to center the needs of these communities within PSPP.

R2P believes that to thrive all community members should have equitable access to City programs and broad commercial opportunities that are low barrier, context-specific, and responsive to diverse communities’ needs. This is paired with the reality that the built environment is neither homogeneous nor equitable in quality or access throughout Portland. On top of this, we support the notion that community-led placemaking opportunities have the potential to increase resilience against involuntary displacement through capacity building.

As such, the project team utilized analyses of existing conditions, preceding policy and planning efforts, engagement with community members, and interesting practices to understand what sorts of barriers to participation in the program and other placemaking projects exist, what—if any—components of the existing City program could be utilized in East Portland—and what sorts of models might better suit the environment to be more context-sensitive and community-respondent.

With all of this in mind, the exploratory nature of this project lends itself to broad objectives around the understanding of existing barriers, opportunities, and broader community needs.

Image and graphical visioning by R2P using Rosewood Site.
KEY TAKEAWYS FROM RECOMMENDATIONS

Through our engagement and research, three themes emerged around which we developed goals and action strategies for BPS and adjacent City agencies. Those themes are as follows:

**Theme 1:** Further Engagement with the Community: The biggest takeaway in our engagement and research is that further and broader engagement based on relationship-building is necessary in East Portland—both in relation to this project and more broadly. We thought about how the City could offer reliable and consistent point-of-contact support for communities or individuals navigating the permitting and placemaking processes outside the right-of-way, how the co-creation of visions and strategies could build community capacity and resilience, and the significance of context-specific engagement strategies. These recommendations go beyond the adaptation of underutilized spaces and consider the fuller and richer understanding, on the part of the City, of the needs and desires of the residents and merchants in the district.

**Theme 2:** Community Capacity Building: Through this theme, we explored ways in which the City could build capacity for businesses as well as residents. We considered that part of the challenges businesses face in East Portland is inequitable access to City resources, political capital, and physical community amenities. It also explored how the physical environment could be improved to encourage outdoor economic activity.

**Theme 3:** Robust and Navigable Support: Throughout this report are references to the challenges our team, and those we worked with, faced understanding and navigating the regulatory environment and where those pursuing outdoor business activity should go for information. We realized that if we as planning students were struggling to understand the regulatory environment that small businesses likely face at least equal if not greater hurdles. We also discovered that, although resources exist, City agencies can improve them and communicate about them better.

We realized that if we as planning students were struggling to understand the regulatory environment that small businesses likely face at least equal if not greater hurdles.
In 2020, in support of business adaptation to the COVID-19 public health crisis, PBOT developed the Healthy Businesses Permit Program for local merchants to obtain permits for the use of streets and sidewalks for commerce as part of its Safe Streets Initiative. However, this program has had almost no success in East Portland; as of June 2021, only five plaza permit holders are located in the district, compared to over 600 elsewhere in the City.

This is the only plaza utilization of the program in East Portland and is the first utilization of the Healthy Businesses Permit for right-of-way or parking adaptation east of Interstate 205.

Locations of Healthy Businesses permits in East Portland (from map above):

A. A tea shop on the corner of SE Division and SE 87th.

B. Three permits clustered around SE Foster and SE 92nd Avenue: a brewery, a tavern, and a bar and food cart pod. These are not physically connected and do not form a plaza.

C. The Parkrose Marketplace, located at NE 108th Avenue near NE Sandy Boulevard.*

*The Parkrose Marketplace plaza permit was organized very near the end of our project and is being led by the Historic Parkrose Neighborhood Prosperity Initiative (NPI). As of June 2021, the plaza has not been opened; it will be a pop-up event monthly through the fall of this year. This is the only plaza utilization of the program in East Portland and is the first utilization of the Healthy Businesses Permit for right-of-way or parking adaptation east of Interstate 205.
A. Ocha Tea is located in King Plaza at near Division St and SE 87th. The plaza has wide walkways that would be suitable for outdoor seating. Ocha Tea occupies the corner of the building and has the opportunity to use its Healthy Businesses permit to expand further into public ROW if it chooses to. One side of Ocha Tea faces the shared plaza parking lot while the other side faces Division St.

B. Image 2 shows Flipside Bar and Food Carts at SE Foster and 92nd Avenue. The red building hosts the bar. Some red tables sit on the sidewalk near the food carts located at the back of the building. Image 2 shows the food carts of Flipside Bar and Food Carts.

C. Image 3 shows the space where the first Parkrose Marketplace pop-up event in May 2021 was held. The street was closed off to offer a safe space for vendors to set up and for visitors to spend time at the event.
In other parts of the City, the right-of-way has been utilized by many business groups in various inner districts, such as the example below (Image 4).  

**IMAGE 4. HEALTHY BUSINESSES PERMIT STREET PLAZA AT SE CLINTON AND 26TH**

Some inner neighborhood streets have been temporarily reallocated for business use as part of PBOT’s Healthy Businesses permit program, such as this one at Southeast Clinton and 26th. No such plazas exist in East Portland. This is in part due to the physical infrastructure of the district, but the lack of success of the program led to the creation of this plan.

East Portland is the easternmost portion of the City, generally located east of Interstate 205 to the north of SE Division to the Columbia River and east of 82nd Avenue to the south of that street to roughly SE Clatsop; it is bound by City limits to the East (Map 2). Annexed mostly after 1980, the district’s neighborhoods overall have built environments based around auto-centric infrastructure (Image 5) and semi-rural policies put in place prior to its annexation. The resulting street network is sparse compared to inner neighborhoods (Figure 2), often lacking sidewalks, safe crossings, or sufficient lighting.

**FIGURE 2. STREET CONNECTIVITY**

- **Highly Connected**  
  Central City Block Pattern  

- **Well Connected**  
  Inner Neighborhood Block Pattern  

- **Poorly Connected**  
  East Portland Block Pattern

Figure recreated by R2P from Portland Bureau of Transportation Connected Centers Plan: Jade and Rosewood.
Map by R2P with datasets from the City of Portland’s PortlandMaps Open Data website. Map represents the boundaries of the East Portland Community Office.
BACKGROUND continued...

**IMAGE 5. SOUTHEAST POWELL BOULEVARD AND 82ND AVENUE**

Many of the commercial areas of East Portland are auto-centric, with wide multi-lane streets such as at this intersection at SE Powell Boulevard and 82nd Avenue. 82nd Avenue, which is roughly the western edge of the district, is one of the most dangerous roads in the city.

During the 1990s and 2000s, rising housing costs and other factors—many resulting from decisions made by planners and policymakers, City-supported market-rate development, and public infrastructure projects—in Portland’s inner neighborhoods led to significant gentrification and the displacement of many low-income and communities of color from those amenity-rich areas to East Portland. While wealthier and whiter people flocked to “revitalized” historic Black Albina and other inner parts of Portland pushing out long-term residents of color. Additionally, powerful NIMBYism and a lack of inclusionary zoning made it so that East Portland became one of the only districts where affordable housing could be easily built.

The sprawling form of East Portland made it ideal for cheap infill development. As a result, a population boom of low-income and communities of color in the district occurred, encouraging segregation in the city. On top of this, lax enforcement of both building codes and owner responsibilities for infrastructure improvements adjacent to new development led to a patchwork of poor-quality buildings—both new and old—around incomplete sidewalks and unimproved roads (Image 6).

Continued population growth in East Portland has highlighted these physical deficiencies, making clear the need for street improvements, accessible transit, public green space and gathering space, and safer street crossings, among others (Figure 3).

**FIGURE 3. INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT NEEDS IN EAST PORTLAND**

- **PAVED STREETS**
- **ACCESSIBLE TRANSIT**
- **PUBLIC GREEN SPACE**
- **SAFER STREET CROSSINGS**

Figure recreated by R2P with icons from Noun Project.
In addition to—and in part resulting from—these structural inequities, the disparate impacts of COVID-19 on BIPOC communities are well documented. Across the country, and in Portland, people of color shoulder a disproportionate burden of illness and death from the virus.\(^9\) In East Portland, residents have gotten sick at more than twice the rate than those west of 82nd Avenue.\(^{20}\) Compounding this fact is that these communities also face disparate economic challenges; they also lack access to reliable business resources and healthcare, and members of these groups are more likely to be frontline workers.\(^{21}\) For those not on the frontline, many residents of East Portland—especially those with low incomes or from communities of color—did not have the choice to work remotely; instead, they faced layoffs. To add to these challenges, many residents of color have experienced decades of income stagnation; this stagnation has been so severe that the median household income (MHI) today for Black households in Portland is less than half that of white households (Table 1).

### TABLE 1. MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME (MHI) BY RACE, PORTLAND (IN 2021 $)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White, Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Black, or African American Alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$76,811</td>
<td>$36,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).

The global pandemic did not cause these inequities. Rather, the effects of COVID-19 have highlighted long standing systemic health and social inequities that put these communities at higher risk. These inequities exist within what public health experts call “social determinants of health” (Figure 4): “Social determinants of health (SDOH) are the conditions in the environment where people are born, live, learn, work, play, worship, and age that affect a wide range of health, functioning, and quality-of-life outcomes.”\(^{22}\)

### FIGURE 4. SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF HEALTH

As outlined in Figure 2 SDOH are numerous and intersectional and include: racism and discrimination; neighborhood and the built environment; education, income, and job opportunities; and more. The social environment of systemic discrimination, disinvestment, gentrification, displacement, and urban exclusion that have become SDOH have, then, immense effects on BIPOC and low-income East Portlanders. It is important to note, also, that these factors have a larger impact on a person’s health status and outcomes than their individual behaviors or factors.\(^{23}\)

Figure created by R2P with icons from Noun Project, indicators from U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion: Social Determinants of Health.
Known colloquially by residents as part of “The Numbers” (in part due to its many streets past 100th Avenue), East Portland is the most racially and ethnically diverse district in the City. A full one third of its residents identify as being members of BIPOC communities. The district has become more diverse in the past decade, is growing more diverse racially and ethnically than Portland as a whole, and is doing so more quickly (Appendix B; Table 1). Of the almost 30,000 residents from communities of color who have moved to the city, almost half have moved to East Portland. This is despite the fact that East Portland, geographically, only makes up a quarter of the city’s landmass. The groups with the largest increases in East Portland are Asian, those identifying as Hispanic or Latinx, and Black/African Americans (Appendix B; Table 1). East Portland is more densely populated than Portland as a whole (Appendix B; Table 2).

Most Racially + Ethnically Diverse District...

More Densely Populated than PDX as whole...

East Portland also has a greater proportion of households speaking languages other English. The most prominent languages spoken in the district (other than English) are Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Russian and other Slavic languages. 

MOST PROMINENT LANGUAGES (other than English):
Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, Russian + Slavic(other)

On top of this, East Portlanders have incomes almost a quarter lower than the city, are more likely to live in poverty, and are more likely to lack health insurance (Appendix B; Tables 4-7). A more detailed demographics overview for the district is available in Appendix B: The “Numbers” by the Numbers.

More Likely to Live in Poverty...
POLICY ALIGNMENT + EXISTING PLANNING EFFORTS

There are many existing plans and policies at local and community levels to address some of the inequities and challenges faced by East Portland residents. Although many of them have been created by siloed government agencies and are planning specific solutions, within the agency’s purview. This limits their ability to integrate cross-agency coordination effectively. The solutions are listed with applicable goals, strategies, or policies specifically relevant to the scope and objectives of Parking Spaces to People Places. More specifically, the things listed focus on equity, public space, commercial activity, economic development, and/or placemaking and community building. These existing documents served as guidance for R2P in its development of recommendations.
REGULATING PARKING LOTS

There are different regulatory, permitting, and the management processes and challenges dependent on the type of parking space, including:\(^{35}\)

**Right of Way (ROW):** If a street or parking space in the ROW is used, coordination with PBOT through their Healthy Businesses permit program or Portland in the Streets program associated requirements.

**Publicly-owned parking lots:** Generally, these spaces are considered better suited to temporary uses like events and pop-ups rather than semi-permanent or permanent reallocations for business or market activities. Anecdotally, we heard that a strong presence at outdoor sites by permit-holders is required for management of issues like graffiti and theft in these spaces. Use depends on the capacity, will, and potential liability on the parts of the decision-makers within these public entities. Willingness likely varies depending on resources available and which institution owns the space.

**Private parking lots:** These spaces are regulated by the Bureau of Development Services (BDS). This means there are fewer regulatory hurdles for temporary outdoor activity in this context. However, there is ambiguity in what the term “temporary” means and a less clear path forward for businesses in terms of what is allowed and how they can operate in these spaces in the medium- and long-term future. If a business owns the parking lot, there is a lot of leeway for what is permissible. However, most of the parking lots we observed are leased and host multiple businesses; this could require landlord permission for use, renting the space, or encourage neighbor disputes among businesses with different goals as to parking lots uses.

As of spring 2021, in the pro-economic growth climate that has evolved as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, permitting agencies currently offer a lot of latitude to businesses. Because of this, issues typically arise from neighbors complaining about those uses or noise. Despite this leniency on the part of the City, there are still permitting hurdles involving various public agencies that businesses might face in using outdoor space, including (but not limited to):

- A permit for outdoor propane or cooking. (Portland Fire & Rescue)
- Temporary outdoor structures are generally allowed, but anything “permanent” may require review. (Bureau of Development Services)
- A noise variance request. (Noise Review Board)
- In rare cases, a zoning variance may be needed if the parking lot is in a non-commercial zone. (Bureau of Development Services)
- Permission from the landlord to operate outside to be able to serve alcohol. (Oregon Liquor Control Commission)

Businesses hoping to use parking lots may face different permitting and regulatory hurdles depending on context.
CHAPTER 2

SITE SELECTION PROCESS

The brief chapter overviews the steps we took to hone in on two smaller geographies to focus our analysis on in East Portland—Rosewood and the Jade District.

**Chapter Outline:**

- Two-Prong Approach
- Geography 1: Jade District
- Geography 2: Rosewood
TWO-PRONG APPROACH

East Portland is the largest geographic district in the city. Due to the limitations in scope of this project primarily resulting from time and resource constraints, R2P utilized a two-pronged approach to focus on two, smaller project geographies within the district. We used the “centers” as defined by the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and steps to ensure equity was incorporated into the project research, the team utilized the following methods:

Prong 1: The first geography selection method is based on community and business interest, capacity, and needs, allowing for the exploration of a potential project more efficiently.

Prong 2: In centering equity more holistically, the team considered community needs and interests more broadly while taking into account the effects of historic racist planning practices—like those mentioned previously in this report—while honing in on an area most underserved by previous planning efforts.

Because East Portland is so diverse and large, it was clear early on that a “one-size-fits-all” approach would not work for this project. While two geographies still cannot represent the diversity of needs or perspectives in the state’s most diverse area, the consideration of two geographies better facilitated the complexity of the project scope.

Furthermore, of the more than 14,000 low-income and cost-burdened renter households in East Portland most at risk of displacement, 97% live in tracts that are already experiencing early or mid-stage gentrification. Understanding this, and everything already mentioned, R2P focused on the project with its potential to help build community capacity and resilience by centering community needs.

For more detailed methodology of the two-prong approach to geography selection, see Appendix C: Site Selection Methodology.
The first approach focused on the centering of community outreach and conversations through a snowball approach to identify a project geography where there is existing community-based organization (CBO) work and broader community interest, potential capacity, and expressed need for potential business expansion or placemaking. The team interviewed representatives from three CBO who had experience in organizing outdoor events; one of them, the Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon (APANO) (Image 8), located in the heart of the Jade District, is a non-profit agency that is involved in the community, organizing cultural and leadership work combined with economic development, and political advocacy. APANO organizes Jade Night Market (Image 9) in the district and has been instrumental in engaging the diverse community of the neighborhood for the event. The Jade Night Market was postponed for the year 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic, but the CBO has the resources and the capacity to implement outdoor events due to its long-established ties and extensive work in the neighborhood. Through the interviews and our brief analysis of the existing conditions, R2P selected the Jade District as the first geography. A more thorough overview of this approach is outlined in the Community Engagement section of this report.

Images:

**IMAGE 8. APANO IN THE JADE DISTRICT**
This image shows the location of APANO’s office, in the heart of the Jade District. APANO organizes Jade Night Market and has been instrumental in engaging the diverse community of the neighborhood for the event.

**IMAGE 9. FIRST ANNUAL JADE NIGHT MARKET**
The first annual Jade International Night Market in 2014 brought in over 20,000 visitors to the event which celebrates the cultural diversity of the district.
GEOGRAPHY 2: ROSEWOOD

R2P selected another geography utilizing the Portland Plan’s Investment Strategy for Complete Centers (Figure 5), which features the same centers identified within the 2035 Comprehensive Plan while considering their needs based on disparities or expected growth through 2035. R2P utilized a set of criteria in order to hone in on a center of high need, with a high concentration of BIPOC, low-income, and/or Limited English Proficiency Households. R2P then analyzed which center is at highest risk for involuntary displacement resulting from gentrification. Finally, the project team analyzed which center lacks physical and community amenities associated with complete centers in existing City plans. Through this approach, the team honed in on Rosewood.

For a detailed methodology and analysis leading to this decision, see Appendix C: Site Selection Methodology.

FIGURE 5. PORTLAND PLAN’S INVESTMENT STRATEGY FOR COMPLETE CENTERS

From the Report: “Circle sizes correspond to center types: Central City (largest), Gateway Regional Center, Town Centers, and then Neighborhood Centers (smallest).”

Darker (or green) circles indicate that a center includes higher than average concentrations of vulnerable residents, such as renters, communities of color, households with low-median incomes and/or low education levels.”
CHAPTER 3
EXISTING CONDITIONS + SITE ANALYSIS

This chapter describes the demographic and physical conditions of both the Jade District and Rosewood, the project's two study areas. It also overviews land use and parcel activity through field analysis.

Chapter Outline:

• Overview + Key Takeaways

• The Jade District
  • Overview
  • The Jade District by the Numbers
  • Existing Community Work
  • Physical Conditions
  • Land Use/Parcel Activity
  • Access + Transit

• Rosewood
  • Overview
  • Rosewood by the Numbers
  • Existing Community Work
  • Physical Conditions
  • Land Use/Parcel Activity
  • Access and Transit
OVERVIEW + KEY TAKEAWAYS

This chapter details the demographics, physical conditions, and site analyses of the Jade District and Rosewood. The areas are unique from one another, East Portland itself, and the rest of Portland. However, some key takeaways include:

- Both areas are significantly more diverse racially and ethnically than the City as a whole, with the Jade District being made up of a majority of BIPOC groups (Figure 6).
- In the Jade District, the largest plurality of nonwhite populations are Asian communities, predominantly Chinese and Vietnamese.
- In Rosewood, the largest population shares of BIPOC groups are Hispanic/Latinx, followed by Asian and Black/African American shares.

Note: While these takeaways are relevant, they do not paint a full picture of the diversity of these areas. For more robust demographic considerations for each geography, please refer to the By The Numbers sections of Appendix B. R2P does not wish to oversimplify the rich details of these neighborhood centers or the communities and individuals who live in them.

FIGURE 6. POPULATION SHARE BY RACE/ETHNICITY, STUDY AREAS VS. PORTLAND, 2019

What does this mean? Residents live in more dense environments while often living farther from where they need to go for work. Individuals often cannot rely on transit or non-motorized transportation; they often work jobs away from the city center in areas served poorly by bus and train or hours when buses run less often. On top of this, they often live in areas lacking safe infrastructure or needed connections in networks that would give them the option to walk or bike.40

Households overall have less access to financial security through homeownership, have less capital, and ultimately lack what they need to be resilient in the face of the rapidly increasing housing and living costs of Portland. They also generally have less access—due to the effects of inequities as described earlier in this report including geographic injustices—to the physical destinations and services needed to survive and thrive in their communities. As previously noted, the causes of these inequities are external to these individuals and result from systemic and institutional decisions rooted in centralized decision-making and racism.

These struggles, however, do not define these communities. They are diverse, with proud cultures in growing community enclaves. They support each other through inventive and resourceful place-based strategies. They are individuals and families of all ages—neighbors, and residents of our city community from around the country and the world who are “strong, resilient, talented, inspiring, and full of dreams and potential.”41
OVERVIEW

Utilizing the approach outlined in the first prong of the project Site Selection process, our conversations with CBOs paired with the time and resource constraints of the project led us to select the Jade District.

Based upon its formal neighborhood center boundaries as defined in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, the following streets roughly define the Jade District: Harrison Street (north), Powell Boulevard (south), 77th Avenue (west), and Interstate 205 (east). Due to the geographic limitations of Census tracts, the data pulled does not exactly match the geography of the formal center (as defined in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan). R2P pulled data for the following Census tract: 83.01 (Map 4). While some of the Jade District’s center goes past the boundaries of this tract to the north and west, it was chosen for the following reasons: the sections west of 82nd Avenue and North Division Street are technically outside of the larger study area of East Portland, and the tract north is also served by the larger Gateway Regional Center.

MAP 4. JADE DISTRICT STUDY AREA AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CENTER

Map by R2P with datasets from the City of Portland’s Portland Maps Open Data website.
THE JADE DISTRICT BY THE NUMBERS

The Jade District’s BIPOC population share is higher than Portland’s, with 51.8% of residents identifying as being part of communities of color. The largest population share is Asian alone, comprising 37.7% of residents (Figure 7). More specifically, the area’s Asian population is predominantly Chinese (60.0%) followed by Vietnamese (33.0%).

FIGURE 7. POPULATION SHARES BY RACE/ETHNICITY, JADE DISTRICT VS. PORTLAND

The Jade District is also more densely populated, like East Portland, than Portland as a whole. However, it is not as dense as Rosewood (Table 2). Household size is also larger in the Jade District than in Portland as a whole, with 5.4% more households being family households than those in the city overall (Figure 8).

TABLE 2. POPULATION DENSITY OF JADE DISTRICT VS. PORTLAND (PER SQUARE MILE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jade District</th>
<th>Portland City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,813</td>
<td>4,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).

FIGURE 8. HOUSEHOLD TYPE AND SIZE (%), JADE DISTRICT VS. PORTLAND CITY

Figure by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).
THE JADE DISTRICT BY THE NUMBERS continued...

The Jade District’s housing units are two-thirds renter-occupied, compared with less than half in Portland as a whole (Table 3). Renters are more susceptible to displacement as a result of gentrification. Also, understanding that home ownership is a primary tool toward wealth creation in the United States, this points to a severe lack of access to affordable homeownership.

**TABLE 3. TENURE OF UNITS (%), JADE DISTRICT VS. PORTLAND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jade District</th>
<th>Portland City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).

While fewer Jade District renter households are rent-burdened—that is, paying more than 30 percent but less than 50 percent of their income on rent, more are severely rent burdened—paying more than 50% of their income on rental costs every month (Table 4). This points to an undersupply of affordable housing options.

**TABLE 4. RENT-BURDENED & SEVERELY RENT-BURDENED HOUSEHOLDS, JADE DISTRICT VS. PORTLAND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jade District</th>
<th>Portland City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent-Burdened (30 - 49%)</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely Rent-Burdened (50%+)</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).

On top of this, Jade’s Median Household Income (MHI) is slightly over half that of Portland’s MHI (Table 5).

**TABLE 5. MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME (MHI), JADE DISTRICT VS. PORTLAND (IN 2021 $)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jade District</th>
<th>Portland City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$36,840</td>
<td>$71,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).

Jade’s population is far more likely to have less than a high school education with over 3x the population share of Portland lacking a diploma or equivalent. On top of this, a smaller population share goes to college at all. Most striking is the population share with an advanced college degree (2.8%) compared to Portland (20%) (Figure 9).

**FIGURE 9. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT FOR POPULATION 25+, JADE DISTRICT VS. PORTLAND**

Figure by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).
Fewer residents in the Jade District have access to a vehicle. They also have less access to reliable frequent transit that gets them where they need to go (Figure 10). As a result, a larger share of residents is forced to drive to work, even though they have more of a challenge accessing a vehicle. Again, this is likely because many of them work in places outside the city center, not served well by existing transit lines. On top of this, no residents bicycle to work at all (from ACS data), compared to 6% for the City (Figure 11). The lack of complete street infrastructure, like protected bike lanes or sidewalks, makes active transportation options challenging or impossible.

**FIGURE 10. VEHICLES AVAILABLE (% OF OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS), JADE DISTRICT VS. PORTLAND**

![Figure 10: Vehicles Available](image)

*Figure by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).*

**FIGURE 11. MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK (FOR WORKERS 16+), JADE DISTRICT VS. PORTLAND**

![Figure 11: Transportation to Work](image)

*Figure by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).*
Of course, living further out, with fewer amenities or jobs nearby, means that commute times are also longer for residents of the Jade District than for the City as a whole (Figure 12).

**FIGURE 12. TRAVEL TIME TO WORK IN MINUTES (FOR WORKERS 16+), JADE DISTRICT VS. PORTLAND**

![Bar chart showing travel time to work in minutes for the Jade District vs. Portland.](Image)

The most common languages spoken in Limited English Proficiency Households located in the Jade District are **Chinese and Vietnamese, with Russian, other Slavic languages, and Spanish being less common but also spoken in the area.**

**EXISTING COMMUNITY WORK**

As mentioned previously, **The Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon (APANO)** is a nonprofit organization serving the Asian and Pacific American communities of Oregon. Located in the heart of the Jade District, the agency works in community organizing, cultural and leadership work and development, and political advocacy. On top of this, APANO has been integral to the community development and business support within the Jade District. As part of their work, the agency also sponsors, organizes, and hosts the annual Jade Night Market, which occurs in the Portland Community College parking lot on the corner of Division Street and SE 82nd Avenue; it was postponed last year (2020) due to the global COVID-19 pandemic.

**IMAGE 10. APANO’S SOCIAL JUSTICE WORK IN THE JADE DISTRICT**

Wanna Lei, the Chinese Community Organizer at APANO. APANO is supporting businesses in the Jade District who have been vandalized and targeted with anti-Asian hate crimes.
THE JADE DISTRICT PHYSICAL CONDITIONS

The Jade District has a fair amount of commercial activity, including restaurants that are centered around different scales of parking lots and nodes of activities. Buildings are typically one to three stories surrounded by a parking lot. A lot of commercial activity happens in “plazas” or small insulated strip malls of varying sizes (Image 11). These “plazas” particularly along SE Division Street east of 82nd Avenue, host restaurants and other businesses such as Division Plaza (9226 SE Division) that could host outdoor commercial activity. Some of the shopping plazas have just one shared entrance/exit (common in the Jade District) or have very limited parking.

There are many restaurants that operate in the large and well utilized parking lots such as the one at 7979 SE Powell Blvd which hosts WinCo foods as an anchor tenant and many smaller restaurants (none with observable outdoor activity) (Image 12).

There was very limited observed existing outdoor commercial activity in the Jade District. However, there is more precedent for outdoor commercial activity since APANO hosts a Jade District Night Market annually in the Portland Community College (PCC) parking lot. Additionally, there is a food cart pod near SE Powell and 82nd which operates near the edge of a large parking lot (Image 13). Also, We All Rise is already working with some businesses on outdoor commercial projects including creating outdoor dining space through a grant with PBOT.

IMAGE 11. KING PLAZA IN THE JADE DISTRICT

8733 SE Division (King Plaza) hosts Wong’s King which closed during the Covid-19 Pandemic. This plaza is an example of the many isolated plazas in Jade District.

IMAGE 12. POWELL STREET STATION IN THE JADE DISTRICT

WinCo and the other retail tenants share a large parking lot.

IMAGE 13. FOOD CART POD IN THE JADE DISTRICT

A food cart pod on Powell and 82nd which operates near the edge of the previously mentioned large parking lot with Winco.
Not unlike other East Portland neighborhoods, the streets and physical layout of the area lends itself to automobile access and use (Map 5). The Jade District has major arterial streets Powell Boulevard, 82nd Avenue, and Division Street that contains most of the commercial activity and denser development. Powell and 82nd are both designated major City streets with multiple wide lanes, and due to the unusually large block sizes have pedestrian crossings spaced far apart. The center is aggressively divided by SE 82nd Avenue, which is a major thoroughfare and—as mentioned previously—is one of the deadliest roads in the City (Image 14). Many of the commercial uses of the area flank this busy street, which would likely cause both noise and air quality issues for outdoor business.

**MAP 5. JAIDE DISTRICT LAND USE**

For more detailed zoning information, see Appendix D; Map D1.

**IMAGE 14. BUSY + DANGEROUS MAJOR THOROUGHFARE IN THE JAIDE DISTRICT**

*SE 82nd Avenue, which is a major thoroughfare and is one of the deadliest roads in the city.*
**THE JADE DISTRICT ACCESS + TRANSIT**

Division is a designated district collector street that sees a fair amount of traffic from its proximity to PCC and I-205. There is relatively poor street connectivity in Jade District; a map of the district (Map 6) show that the streets do not follow the much tighter grid seen in inner Portland. There are transit lines that run east-west on SE Division (Image 15) and SE Powell which allows the center to be easily accessible to other areas of the city in those directions.

**MAP 6. JADE DISTRICT ACCESS AND TRANSIT**

![Map of the Jade District](Image by R2P with datasets from the City of Portland and Multnomah County Assessor's Office.)

**IMAGE 15. TRIMET #4 BUS IN THE JADE DISTRICT**

![Image of a Trimet #4 bus on SE 82nd Avenue](Image by Oregon Metro.)

*Line 4-Division Route Bus on the wide and busy SE 82nd Avenue.*
As defined as a neighborhood center within the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, the boundaries of Rosewood are roughly defined by the following boundary streets: Glisan Street (north), Alder Street (south), 144th Avenue (west) and 162nd Avenue (east). Due to the nature of geographic limitations of Census tracts and block groups, the data pulled for this report does not exactly match the same geography; as the boundaries of census tracts run through the Rosewood center, R2P pulled data on the four census block groups best overlapping the center geography without overlapping other centers in East Portland (Map 7).

Those census block groups are:
• Block Group 1, Census Tract 92.02;
• Block Groups 2 and 3, Census Tract 93.01;
• Block Group 1, Census Tract 97.01.

Map 7. Rosewood Study Area and Comprehensive Plan Center

Map by R2P with datasets from the City of Portland’s Portland Maps Open Data website.
ROSEWOOD BY THE NUMBERS

Rosewood’s BIPOC population share is higher than the Jade District and Rosewood with 39.7% of the area’s population identifying as being part of BIPOC communities. The largest population shares by race/ethnicity include (all of these shares are over twice as high as those for Portland at large) (Figure 13): 21.0% Hispanic or Latinx; 19.4%, Asian alone; 13.2% Black or African American.

FIGURE 13. POPULATION SHARE BY RACE/ETHNICITY, ROSEWOOD VS. PORTLAND

![Figure 13. Population Share by Race/Ethnicity, Rosewood vs. Portland](image)

Rosewood is also quite dense in population, with a population density over twice as high as Portland’s (Table 6). Rosewood also has more family households than Portland as a whole, and its household sizes skew larger than the city’s (Figure 14).

TABLE 6. POPULATION DENSITY OF ROSEWOOD VS. PORTLAND (PER SQUARE MILE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rosewood</th>
<th>Portland City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,023</td>
<td>4,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).

FIGURE 14. HOUSEHOLD TYPE AND SIZE (%), ROSEWOOD VS. PORTLAND CITY

![Figure 14. Household Type and Size, Rosewood vs. Portland City](image)
As opposed to East Portland, Rosewood has a significantly lower owner-occupied housing share than Portland. Two thirds of its residents are renters, making them more susceptible to displacement (Table 7).

*For more detailed information about East Portland’s tenure of units, see Appendix B, Table B5.*

**TABLE 7. TENURE OF UNITS (%), ROSEWOOD VS. PORTLAND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rosewood</th>
<th>Portland City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).*

When considering whether or not households are rent-burdened, the number is especially striking. Almost twice as much of household share is severely rent-burdened in Rosewood when compared to Portland—almost a full half of the area’s renters (Table 8).

**TABLE 8. RENT-BURDENED & SEVERELY RENT-BURDENED HOUSEHOLDS, ROSEWOOD VS. PORTLAND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rosewood</th>
<th>Portland City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent-Burdened (30 - 49%)</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely Rent-Burdened (50%+)</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).*

While poverty rates were not available for this geography combination, Rosewood’s Median Household Income (MHI) is less than half of the City’s (Table 7). Rosewood’s MHI is nearly $20,000 less than for East Portland. Rosewood’s residents have less access to capital through home ownership or high-paying jobs (Table 9).

*For more detailed information about East Portland’s MHI and poverty rates, see Appendix B, Tables B3 & B4.*

**TABLE 9. MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME (MHI), ROSEWOOD VS. PORTLAND (IN 2021 $)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rosewood</th>
<th>Portland City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$34,295</td>
<td>$71,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).*

Rosewood’s residents are much more likely to lack a high school diploma or equivalent, with three times the Portland share lacking one. Even more, its population share has a third the amount of Bachelor’s degrees as the city, and five times fewer advanced degrees (Figure 15).

**FIGURE 15. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT FOR POPULATION 25+, ROSEWOOD VS. PORTLAND**

*Figure by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).*
Residents of Rosewood are less likely to have access to a vehicle and also have less reliable access to frequent transit (Figure 16). Despite this, Rosewood’s residents drive more often to work than do other Portlanders; this is likely less due to personal choice than to necessity, as many Rosewood residents are likely to work in areas outside of the City center not reliably served by transit options. On top of this, Rosewood (in common with other East Portland neighborhoods) lacks active transportation infrastructure, making it difficult for residents to get around via bicycle, wheelchair, or on foot (Figure 17).

**FIGURE 16. VEHICLES AVAILABLE (% OF OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS), ROSEWOOD VS. PORTLAND**

![Figure 16](image1.png)

*Figure by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).*

**FIGURE 17. MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK (FOR WORKERS 16+), ROSEWOOD VS. PORTLAND**

![Figure 17](image2.png)

*Figure by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).*
All that said, it is likely unsurprising, then, that workers over 16 in Rosewood often have a commute time to work higher than Portland as a whole. Again, this is likely due to a combination of lack of reliable transit options between work and home paired with employment outside of the City center (Figure 18).

**FIGURE 18. TRAVEL TIME TO WORK IN MINUTES (FOR WORKERS 16+), ROSEWOOD VS. PORTLAND**

Unfortunately, language data is not available at the block group level well enough to be utilized in a table form. However, review of ACS data shows that Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Russian and other Slavic languages are spoken within Rosewood.

**ROSEWOOD EXISTING COMMUNITY WORK**

One place-based nonprofit organization serving Rosewood, called Rosewood Initiative, exists near the center of R2P’s Rosewood study area. The organization focuses on various forms of community building, household and food security, language and job assistance, and more. They have also mounted a very robust covid-19 response in the area, aiding with relief fund distribution to Rosewood’s diverse residents. R2P has reached out to the organization, and that discussion is outlined in the Community Engagement section of this report.

**IMAGE 16. ROSEWOOD INITIATIVE**

Image by Rosewood Initiative at their mural (in the Rosewood Village Square Plaza) designed by Antwoine Thomas after months of collaboration with the community.
ROSEWOOD PHYSICAL CONDITIONS

Despite overall density much higher than the City’s, Rosewood does not feel that way. In general, its buildings are one to three stories, surrounded by parking lots. While the zoning code allows for more density—particularly along SE Stark, the buildings are currently a mix of low density commercial buildings and medium density apartments (Image 17; Appendix D: Map 2).

Both visually and physically, asphalt is a common theme in Rosewood, with wide, multi-lane SE Stark framing large parking lots around shopping centers and strip malls (Image 18). Few of these areas feel conducive for safe and enjoyable outdoor business activities. Very few pedestrians were utilizing the street on the Sunday afternoon we visited the community.

Despite this, there are no obvious collective commercial areas. Small islands of commercial activity are sparsely dotted along rows of apartment complexes. (Image 19).

Despite the density, the sidewalks are also relatively narrow, especially in contrast with the four-lane plus turning lane Stark (Image 19).

The area has construction occurring in it. However, it is mostly residential apartment complexes with no incorporated commercial space (not mixed-use development). (Images 20 and 21).

Off of these higher-volume corridors that have seen improvements due to transit investments like the MAX Blue Line, streets lack protected sidewalks, like in the image below. (Image 22).
As Rosewood grows in population and density, development is occurring in the area. However, much of it is residential only, such as this planned development at 208 SE 148th Avenue. Where this Spanish-Language church stands, a multifamily complex of approximately 150 dwelling units is planned.

Another apartment building goes up adjacent to the MAX Light Rail Blue Line near SE Burnside Street and 162nd Avenue. This station and development are technically within the boundaries of the neighboring city of Gresham.

Away from major transportation infrastructure projects like the MAX Light rail, neighborhood streets in Rosewood often lack sidewalks.
There are over 150 businesses in this area. Over two-thirds are independently owned and operated. However, few—only around 10—are observable as culturally or ethnically specific. Very few of them have models conducive to outdoor commercial extension or activity—such as restaurants or retail shops.

On top of these challenges, there are others that exist toward utilizing one or some of the privately-owned parking lots adjacent to the buildings that house many of Rosewood’s brick-and-mortar businesses. Most of the commercial activity in the area is along SE Stark Street, which is heavily trafficked. On top of this, many of the parking lots are very large and well-utilized by automobiles and automobile-serving, making it difficult to discern where an activity or market might be hosted (Image 22). Another business center on 148th and Stark reserves the parking lot for a gas station; such a use might increase risk for pollution exposure by adjacent users.

For more detailed zoning information, see Appendix D; Map D2.

For detailed information on Rosewood Businesses, see Appendix E; Map E1 and Table E1.

**IMAGE 22. PARKING LOT DEALERSHIP AT 1400 SE STARK ST**

*Image by R2P.*

A parking lot, currently being utilized as a car dealership, is fenced off from the sea of concrete along SE Stark. Here, the sidewalk is incredibly narrow, despite the bus stop.
On our site visit, however, we did observe a tamale vendor (Image 23) and a local church (Image 24) utilizing the large parking lot at 16126 SE Stark for outdoor activity. This lot also serves the Rosewood Initiative and Su Casa Grocer, so a portion of the lot has potential as an opportunity site (Images 25 -26). Other possible locations in the areas with potential include the churches which are connected to large parking lots. We also identified an unused gravel lot at 16110 E Burnside Street (Image 27); it is owned by the nonprofit health clinic Outside In (Image 28). It has trees on the lot for shade, and—as it is adjacent to the MAX light rail stop—it might be conducive to some form of market or business utilization.

**Images 25 + 26. Shared Parking Lot for Rosewood Initiative at Village Square Plaza**

*Image 25 + 26. Shared Parking Lot for Rosewood Initiative at Village Square Plaza. Rosewood Initiative shares a large parking lot with other tenants in the Village Square Plaza.*

**Image 27 + 28. Unused Parking Lot Owned by Non-Profit Health Clinic**

*Image 27 shows the unused gravel lot at 16110 E Burnside Street (next to Outside In clinic, Image 28). This lot is across from the MAX light rail stop on Burnside and 162nd Avenue. We could see potential in this site for an outdoor market.*
Accessibility is an important factor in choosing a site for an outdoor event. See Map 9 for current transit options. For markets (such as farmer’s markets) foot traffic is often a prerequisite for success. Through the wide streets and ample parking in the area, access by car is easy. Transit and bus lines do run East to West along Burnside and Stark Streets. Burnside offers the flexible transit options with multimodal infrastructure and the Trimet Max Blue Line. We were unable to find quality data related to American Disabilities Act (ADA) access and infrastructure in the area, but based on our site visit and observation there is likely a need to improve sidewalks for pedestrian use.
CHAPTER 4
PUBLIC + INTERAGENCY ENGAGEMENT

This chapter overviews the purpose and methods utilized in the engagement process. It summarizes the interviews we conducted with highlights and takeaways from conversations with community stakeholders, CBOs, market operators, and technical assistants at the City of Portland.

Chapter Outline:

- Engagement Overview
  - Goals + Objectives
  - What We Accomplished
- Conversation Summaries
  - City Agencies and Leaders in Tactical Urbanism Projects
  - Market Organizers
  - Community-Based Organizations
- Key Takeaways
R2P wanted to conduct interviews with community-based organizations and businesses identified with the assistance of BPS. The goal of the public engagement process was to explore the interest in access to new outdoor market space and community space, what barriers might exist to entry (both within the regulatory system and beyond), and also identify community needs more broadly.

The team also interviewed technical assistants at BPS and PBOT to overview regulatory processes, potential inter-agency coordination, and previous outreach efforts. As the team recognized that BIPOC and immigrant communities are often overburdened with requests to share information about their communities, we focused on having community based organizations connect us to businesses which presented us with some challenges discussed in the Limitations section.

**FIGURE 19. ENGAGEMENT MAP**
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WHAT WE ACCOMPLISHED

Who did we connect with...?  
What did we connect about...?  
Why did we connect with them...?  

Feat 1. **Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS)**  
*Pursued connections from our client BPS*

We worked with our client the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability to get insight into who was working on outdoor markets and projects and to help connect us to people.

Feat 2. **Learning by Doing Streets for People**  
*Attended two PSU Urban Design Collaborative’s workshops*

We attended two meetings as part of PSU Urban Design Collaborative’s ‘Learning by Doing Streets for People’ workshops which hosted different agencies and thought leaders to learn more about different programs and projects trying to implement tactile urban design projects in streets and parking spaces.

Feat 3. **Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT)**  
*Interviewed two PBOT employees*

We interviewed two people from PBOT to learn more about their roles and what has worked or been challenging for them in implementing the Healthy Businesses permit Program.

Feat 4. **The City Repair + Center for Public Interest Design (CPID)**  
*SPOKE with the Design Director from the City Repair who also works with CPID*

We spoke with the current Design Director from the City Repair Project who also works with the Center for Public Interest Design. Last summer she created a collaboration between the two organizations and local architecture firms to research and design for BIPOC communities use of the Healthy Business Permit Program.
WHAT WE ACCOMPLISHED continued...

Who did we connect with...?
What did we connect about...?
Why did we connect with them...?

5. **Neighborhood Prosperity Networks**
*Interviewed three members from Parkrose, Rosewood, and the Jade District*

We interviewed three members of Neighborhood Prosperity Networks in Parkrose, Rosewood, and the Jade District to understand what opportunities and challenges for outdoor economic activity exist in East Portland and within their specific neighborhoods.

6. **We All Rise Consulting Firm**
*Interviewed consultant*

We interviewed We All Rise (a small consultant firm) currently working in the field of space activation to understand how the City could expand and support their efforts. The firm led the public engagement efforts in East Portland for the Healthy Businesses permit Program last summer (2020).

7. **Local Market Organizers**
*Spoke with managers from three markets in Portland*

We spoke with three market managers in Portland about their experience in working with micro enterprises, BIPOC and Native owned businesses, and in hosting larger events for businesses in public space.

8. **Businesses + Vendors**
*Attempted to use CBO’s and market organizers to connect with businesses*

We tried to connect with businesses and vendors through CBO’s and market organizers but were met with challenges including a lack of interest and others that are explained in more detail in Chapter 8: Project Limitations.
CONVERSATION SUMMARIES

CONVERSATIONS WITH CITY AGENCIES AND LEADERS IN TACTICAL URBANISM PROJECTS

City agencies had information on existing programs and regulatory challenges which were discussed in the discussion of parking lot regulations. What we uncovered is that people have the ability to create different types of structures in parking lots as long as they are temporary, which is not well defined. Most of the time if the City gets involved due to outdoor activity it is because someone has complained or if there are neighbor-to-neighbor disputes. However, agency leaders have heard that people may struggle with the ambiguity of knowing what they are allowed to do in those spaces and the lack of communication on the subject may be a barrier to businesses implementing projects.

There were many lessons learned from the successful Healthy Businesses Permit Program including having access to quick-build materials. It is important to create intimate human scale interaction and that these projects are difficult on busy main transportation thoroughfares. Also, successful plazas are collaborative, require community support, and benefit from program activation.

The team was also able to uncover some of the challenges in promoting equity with the Healthy Businesses permit program. It was recognized that the quick timeline associated with the Healthy Businesses permit Program created issues of equity. Businesses with economic means are more likely to take advantage of the program; one interviewee stated, “Everything experimental takes resources.” There were also barriers around engagement due to the quick timeline of the program. City bureaus noticed a disparity in businesses applying for the permits in inner Portland compared to businesses in East Portland.

Safety has been a reported issue with the Healthy Businesses permit Program with many businesses experiencing theft or vandalism after making investments in outdoor seating and dining. The businesses that have personnel present more often are less likely to encounter problems, which may create challenges for businesses that do not have adjacent brick and mortar stores. Businesses on private property have a lot of leeway in controlling who can enter their premises and can have people removed if needed. However, there are efforts from groups like Pause Before You Call which helps businesses and community members become more aware of concerns around impacts of policing on communities of color and those without traditional homes.

“Everything experimental takes resources.”
CONVERSATIONS WITH MARKET ORGANIZERS

In conversations with the different market organizers, we learned that there are a lot of complexities in organizing a market. We spoke with market organizers who shared their experiences wearing many different hats. They handle logistics of an event, screen vendor applications, provide small business coaching support, and navigate through the regulatory processes for the event and its vendors. These positions are also not well-paid which can contribute to burnout or turnover.

Navigating the regulatory process can be very difficult and frustrating. Different vendors may need different permits based on their business type (for instance, a food handling certificate or permit to sell fresh produce may be needed). Many small businesses struggled with navigating the process to be able to accept SNAP benefits. For micro enterprises operating in these spaces this means they needed a lot of logistical support from the market organizers. Market organizers often need event software which can run in the hundreds of dollars per month, additionally finding sources of funding for these markets can require effort and people familiar with applying for grant programs.

The physical space is important to consider for the success of a market event. One of the Market Organizers felt that the rising popularity of food cart pods meant less space available for events like outdoor markets. Markets are often held on private property which has varying rates to use the space. Churches might loan their parking lots on days with no congregation, but renting a space can cost thousands of dollars per day. There are also other things to consider to attract customers. Markets depend on having a customer base already within walking distance, lots of foot traffic, and easy access (walkability, transit access, and parking availability) to the event space.

"Access without support is not opportunity."

"[City] need[s] to stop opening doors and assuming people will walk through them."
We spoke with We All Rise, a consultant firm with strong community ties, about their experience heading the public engagement efforts for the Healthy Businesses permit Program in East Portland last summer. We heard familiar thoughts and concerns about regulatory processes being costly and time intensive, difficulties in engaging the many different East Portland communities within a short amount of time, lack of street infrastructure that would make outdoor expansion more appealing, and access to information about available City resources.

We also spoke with community-based organizations that represent three different neighborhood districts in East Portland: APANO (Jade District), Historic Parkrose (Parkrose), and Rosewood Initiative (Rosewood). The conversations tended to be more event focused (we heard about past and upcoming community events each organization has helped organize and facilitate), but the organizations also shared the various initiatives they have been involved in to help businesses during the pandemic. The interviewees emphasized the importance of relationship building and maintaining close ties with community members and businesses in their district and neighboring districts. There is community interest in more space for outdoor events, but there are various barriers to hosting events in East Portland, including time and resources.

Organizational capacity to coordinate events varied amongst the CBOs. Interviewees shared struggles with getting access to funding and other resources, having enough staff members to hold an event, and event insurance was brought up as a big financial burden for event organizers. Some felt that there was a lack of communication about existing City programs and available resources and information. Additionally, permitting processes pose a significant barrier to many community members both in time and cost. Not every organization has staff members with enough experience and institutional knowledge to navigate regulatory processes. Lastly, we heard some questions around the stewardship of events and spaces, and also (again) concerns about safety.

“We don’t need the City to be that prescriptive about it. Just giving like a neighborhood association like $10,000 to activate their Main St or their park is enough”
What did we learn...?

In some areas there was overlap especially in terms of key themes including the complexity of navigating regulatory processes, the costs associated with implementing outdoor economic activity, safety, and issues with current street infrastructure in East Portland.

We heard familiar things about the lacking street infrastructure in East Portland (see Existing Conditions for more details) and concerns about safety. Some of the busiest and dangerous streets (i.e. vehicle-pedestrian incidents) are in East Portland, and some streets still lack sidewalks. Busy traffic, lack of shade from sparse tree coverage, and noise/air pollution from the busy streets create a less than pleasant atmosphere for outdoor placemaking.

The information we gathered in terms of using parking spaces for outdoor commercial use highlighted that familiarity and capacity to navigate City processes for permitting varied, being that for some it was not a big deal because those organizations had staff members knowledgeable about how to apply for permits and what to do to get through that process. For others this presented a much larger challenge.

Interviewees also shared struggles with getting access to funding and other resources and event insurance was brought up as a big financial burden for event organizers. Some felt that there was a lack of communication about available resources and information. We heard some questions around the stewardship of events and spaces, and also (again) concerns about safety. Additionally, permitting processes present a barrier to many community members both in time and cost, considering that holding events can be very costly and time intensive. From our conversations, we can discern that there is a call for more investment in making spaces more pleasant in East Portland, but people also want better access to funding, event equipment, and technical assistance.

CONCERNS + BARRIERS voiced during engagement about new outdoor market and/or community space:

REGULATORY HURDLES • COST OF IMPLEMENTATION • INFRASTRUCTURE ISSUES

SAFETY CONCERNS • BUSY TRAFFIC • LACK OF SHADE • NOISE/AIR POLLUTION

ACCESS TO RESOURCES • EVENT INSURANCE • LACK OF TECHNICAL HELP

Icons from the Noun Project.
CHAPTER 5
CASE STUDIES

This chapter overviews the approach that R2P has taken in researching interesting practices in street reallocation and low-barrier market creation, with a focus on those both within Portland and outside of euro-centric models. The cases are summarized with consideration of their applicability to the East Portland context.

Chapter Outline:

- Purpose of Study
- Case Studies Selection Criteria
- Case Study #1:
  - Come Thru Market
- Case Study #2:
  - Naya Native Made Pop-up Market
- Case Study #3:
  - New York Street Eateries and Restaurant
- Case Study #4:
  - Historic Market Square, San Antonio
- Case Study #5:
  - Richmond Night Market, Vancouver BC
- Case Study #6:
  - Study of South American Mercados
- Case Study #7:
  - Sweden’s Version of Parking Spaces to People Places

Key Takeaways
**PURPOSE OF STUDY**

The Right to Place Collaborative team performed desk research and community outreach to explore interesting practices and precedents of markets and events around Portland and beyond, that have been operating outdoor or semi-outdoor commerce and community events before and during the pandemic. The selected case studies reflect the improvisation of outdoor public space with the prioritization of low-barrier models, multi-modal and locational accessibility, size and feasibility of the markets, and their applicability to diverse neighborhoods. The case studies review includes concentration on practices beyond Euro-centric models such as South American Mercados in the countries of Peru, Chile, Argentina while case studies focussed within North America and Europe highlight the utilization of adjacent parking and parking lots for temporary seating and events such as farmers or night markets. All of the case studies signify the creation of vibrant community space in existing outdoor public infrastructure. The review highlights the need for a bottom-up approach, support from the City, quality of surrounding urban space, market feasibility, and economic development as the key themes around these case studies.

The research of the interesting practices was done to guide the project’s understanding of operational, logistical opportunities, and challenges for outdoor markets and events that could inform the final recommendations of the project.

The case study review incorporates a sequential process to arrive at key takeaways for the project that will follow:

- Summarizing the interesting practices.
- Analyzing the case studies to recognize common themes and practices that could be incorporated as suggestions for East Portland.
- Drawing out key takeaways for East Portland from the case studies summary to inform the final recommendations of the project.

**CASE STUDIES SELECTION CRITERIA**

The selection of case studies was guided by a few different criteria that were paired with the directives from the client, BPS, to arrive at a representative sample of case studies. An extensive selection process was set in place to ensure a good mix of case studies that would enable us to form a well-rounded set of recommendations for the project.

The following set of criteria in project selection were considered to compile the final list of case studies:

- Projects at varied geography levels—local, national, and international precedents.
- Projects with variety of outdoor market/event set up—
  - Temporary v/s permanent markets
  - Outdoor v/s semi-outdoor markets
  - Daily markets v/s weekly or monthly markets
- Projects with outdoor commerce that are planned v/s improvised outdoor events.
CASE STUDY #1

COME THRU MARKET, PORTLAND

The Come Thru Market is a local Portland-based community market centered around BIPOC farmers; it has been operational for the past three years at the Redd event center on 8th and Salmon in SE Portland. It is also an incubator market with 18 farmer vendors as of 2021, who are in farmer’s training programs with the market. The market through its incubator program seeks to address the local food system issue and raise awareness about minority owned farmer’s businesses. The market via its training program supports farmers of color including immigrants and refugees, in their beginning stages to build their readiness for selling and operating at farmers markets and getting successful at that. The project team as a part of its community outreach interviewed the lead organizer & director of the Come Thru Market, who talked about the opportunities and operational challenges of a local market in Portland. According to them, “Portland promotes itself as a walkable/bikeable city, but infrastructure is lacking in many parts of the city, specifically in East Portland.” There are high fatality rates in East Portland and aspirational neighborhood building the City is forgetting to establish basic necessities for safety and accessibility—which markets depend on. Outdoor markets and events such as the Come Thru Market “need spaces where people can feel safe to walk around and participate.”

Key Features:

**Strengthening BIPOC community**  The market is centered around Black, Indigenous, immigrants, and refugee populations to create awareness and economic development opportunities for low-income, minority populations in the city of Portland, OR.

**A diverse array of goods**  The market features around 40 BIPOC owned businesses as its vendors that are located throughout the Portland metro area, selling goods such as fresh produce, baked items, gourmet ice-creams, handmade candles and ceramics to name a few.

**Creating an all inclusive space**  “Farmers markets in the US are inherently white supremacist spaces”, quoted by someone from the market; Come Thru Market is creating a space for the BIPOC population in these markets by holding market events and building an incubator training program for beginning farmers.
CASE STUDY #2

NAYA NATIVE MADE POP-UP MARKET

The NAYA pop-up market is a market event centered around Native and Indigenous community members to promote and sell their products directly to the customers. The market is held in a partnership with Our 42nd Avenue and Cully Boulevard Alliance, two district-level Neighborhood Prosperity Initiative (NPI) groups. This sort of community collaboration efforts improve economic development opportunities for the Native community—it ensures more people are engaged (both in terms of vendor and customer participation) in the event. According to the market organizer interviewed for the community outreach, 75% of the guests are non-native identifying and the foot traffic is getting better every weekend. Rotating vendors, who are mostly from the Portland metro around a 25-30 miles radius, participate at the event; business vendors also have the option to drop-off their products for sale at the market, and the payments are done through Venmo or Cash apps. The alliance with NPIs has been fruitful in getting more guests, customers, and volunteers to the market.

Key Features:

**Support for Native-owned businesses**  The market gives a platform to the Native and Indigenous vendors and business owners to sell their products directly to the customers.

**Economic development opportunity**  The pop-up market provides economic development opportunities to the upcoming Native businesses and provides business and operational assistance to the established vendors.

**Increased awareness of Native art and products**  Through the NAYA marketplace non-native customers can participate and buy Native art and products; this creates more increased awareness and customer base for the Native products in Portland.
CASE STUDY #3

NEW YORK STREET EATERIES AND RESTAURANTS

During the covid-19 pandemic, the city of New York allowed outdoor dining when it entered its second phase of reopening with the directions to follow social distancing, safety, and accessibility guidelines. Following the guidelines, several restaurants were able to utilize and create accessible and comfortable outdoor seating space in the adjacent parking space for their customers allowing them to participate in social gatherings outside the restaurant—in the public realm. The transformation of adjacent parking spaces for outdoor seating and dining created an improvised public space that prioritizes people over parking space. The process led to incredible changes to the built environment that has grown from a bottom-up approach, demonstrating the community’s resilience and desire to bring positive change in the community quickly and effectively.

**Key Features:**

- **Bottom-up approach** Improvisational placemaking efforts to create outdoor gathering and eating space by the community (i.e., the restaurant and the eateries owner) for the community (the customers and the general public) to accommodate the need for public interaction during the pandemic, with social distancing guidelines.
- **Visual and social vibrancy** Created as a result of increased outdoor public activities and creative place making techniques such as comfortable outdoor seating, quick built screens and temporary landscape features.
- **Traffic calming features** As a result of improvisational placemaking traffic calming features such as the outdoor seating and landscape created safer public streets with decreased car traffic and parking.

Images by Curbed.
The Historic Market Square located in downtown San Antonio is the largest Mexican market outside of the US that hosts a farmer’s market, mercado shops, and cultural events held every weekend. The square is anchored by historical eateries such as the “Mi Tierra Cafe Y Panaderia” and “La Margarita Mexican Restaurant & Oyster Bar”. Apart from hosting 32 specialty shops in the mercado section, the outdoor plaza hosts vendors and local businesses that collectively attract locals and tourists from all over the country. While some of the buildings in the plaza are privately owned, most of the building and the outdoor events are managed by the City of San Antonio.

The plaza-like setting of the Market Square includes the historic ‘El Mercado’ building built as an open-air structure as a part of the Works Progress Administration Project; the building served as an open-air Farmers Market until its renovation, and was retrofitted with air conditioners and upgraded into a mercado for selling artisanal and ethnic goods such as pottery, leathers, arts, and keepsakes. The square is also the site of Cinco de Mayo and many fiestas for the city of San Antonio that reflect the local and diverse culture of the city to the visitors.

**Key Features:**

- **City as a partner** Outdoor market and event programming activated with support from the City of San Antonio— this creates an ideal partnership between the community and the public agency.
- **Anchor businesses** The outdoor market and plaza events are anchored by the historical and permanently located cafes, eateries, and the existing mercado market that attract both local visitors and tourists alike.
- **Local & tourist destination** The market square is a local and tourist attraction; it creates an ideal opportunity for ethnic and diverse businesses to showcase the local and diverse culture of the city to the visitors.
CASE STUDY #5

RICHMOND NIGHT MARKET, VANCOUVER BC

One of the biggest outdoor night markets in Canada, the annual event replicates the Asian night market experience for its approximately 74% Asian population who reside in Richmond BC. Located near Canada Line’s Bridgeport station and the famous River Rock casino resort, the market is held during the summer months on weekends and features around 250 merchandise vendors and 100 food vendors and attracts visitors from all over the city and beyond. The market serves diverse Asian food such as Vietnamese and Korean cuisines and desserts, as well as Brazilian comfort food and other ethnically diverse cuisine options. Richmond’s diverse population provides a strong Asian influence on the market, and the majority of merchandise vendors are home-based businesses and come to the market to sell their goods which mean most of the products that are sold in the market are not found in retail stores and are therefore unique. Apart from commerce, the market also features community events or cultural festivities, such as the Filipino festival, Korean Heritage Day, and local band and dance performances. The idea and execution of the night market were initiated by an entrepreneur that later became highly successful in attracting several visitors to the market.

Culturally Diverse / all inclusive space  Outdoor market engaging the diverse particularly Asian population of the Vancouver Metro, that attracts a large number of locals and tourists.

Initiated on a surface parking lot  The market initially began its operation on a surface parking lot about 20 years ago and later moved to various other locations including a shopping center complex and a mall to accommodate growth for the increasing number of vendors and visitors to the market.

Thriving community event  Close resemblance to an authentic Asian night market outside Asia and serves as a vibrant community gathering place for shopping and eating Asian-festival style foods.

Bottom-up approach  A community market that was initiated by a local entrepreneur transformed into a destination for the locals and the tourists alike.
CASE STUDY #6

STUDY OF SOUTH AMERICAN MERCADOS

The case study of South American Mercados is an analytical review of twenty local markets of various types, operational sizes, and frequencies that reflect a diverse spread of local informal markets across 12 cities in five South American countries including Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Argentina & Uruguay. The case study was selected to integrate interesting practices outside of the US that reflect cultural and operational diversity. Public markets are a thriving place in most South American communities and are the primary centers of commercial and social activity engaging a diverse community that sells a wide range of goods and food items. Mercados also include informal flea markets that take place on roadway medians, restored fish market buildings with fine seafood restaurants, and other dining and shopping places that serve as an anchor to these markets.

All the mercados listed in the study occur year-round due to the favorable climate and high public demand; they are mostly accessible by public transit or private vehicles. Most are surrounded by walkable streets, but bike infrastructure such as bike lanes and bike parking is often non-existent.

Mercados highlights the fact that “A city’s dynamism is created by the unplanned collision of people and the resulting exchange of goods, skills, and ideas.”

Key Features:

**Varied styles of market organization** The setting is indoor inside of an informal market structure—with a common roof but no attached walls, and street market. This is similar to a farmers market where vendors have their canopies of umbrellas installed with no permanent structure overhead. Additionally, street markets are visibly fluid and stalls often spill over onto the adjacent streets and alleyways.

**Accessibility** Markets are easily accessible through public transit, private vehicles and are surrounded by walkable streets making them accessible to most community members.

**Convenient schedule** Most of the markets reviewed operate all year and all day long, which makes them convenient and accessible to community members with varying work time schedules.

**Market spill-over effect** Some of the markets have a plaza or a public space adjacent to them, where public activity often spills over into the adjacent plazas activating the space adjacent to these markets.

**Visual and social vibrancy** The indoor-outdoor informal markets add visual and social vibrancy on the streets and the adjacent plazas due to the market spill-over effects.
Sweden’s experimental efforts to create urban pop-up spaces during the COVID-19 pandemic have led to the creation of outdoor seating for people utilizing the car parking space outside the local businesses. The idea to create active outdoor spaces specifically around local businesses arose out of tactical urbanism but with a more strategic approach. The designers of the program hope to see if the government or the public agencies could utilize such a ‘tactical urbanism’ strategy to activate outdoor spaces for the people and at the same time reduce car traffic in the neighborhood to create a welcoming and safe environment for the users of the space. The effort is a refinement of the “15-minute city” concept towards a “one-minute city” where people could walk or bike-ride to important amenities in 15 minutes—versus people engaging with the surroundings and neighborhoods within a 1-minute walk and bike distance.

Key Features:

**Ease of applicability**  The city uses a lego-like module system to create a modular wood seating framework. It can easily be scaled and installed in one or several parking spaces in a limited amount of time.

**An intentional approach to seating design and arrangement**  Intentional position of outdoor seating arranged to face the pavement to create a micro-space with the pop-up and sidewalk.

**People space over parking space**  Nearby businesses that were skeptical about losing parking spaces and their customers acknowledge many people are abandoning their cars nowadays due to difficulty in driving in the neighborhood due to the capacity of roads.

**Convenient location**  Several people enjoy coffee, food, and company in the pop-up space, despite subzero temperatures, which indicates there is a need for such outdoor spaces in urban areas during the pandemic and beyond. These spaces need to be adjacent to places that are conveniently accessible to people living nearby. A group of 322 people who were surveyed about the project agrees that there is a rise in movement of people and street activation around the installed seating units.
KEY TAKEAWAYS

Accessibility
The case studies highlighted the significance of multi-modal accessibility to increase public participation in the markets which is required for market success and economic feasibility. As pointed out in the existing conditions, East Portland lacks the physical infrastructure critical for operating successful outdoor markets such as walkable streets, safer street crossings, and accessible bike infrastructure.

Bottom-Up Approach
Improvisational placemaking as seen in precedent studies is a powerful tool for improving usability and quality of public space. An improvisational effort is a bottom-up approach that requires the community or the neighborhoods to create vibrant public space for social gathering within the legal framework of the City. For East Portland, the efforts to create vibrant outdoor public space requires community buy-in and participation but lack of physical infrastructure creates a barrier for such efforts and thus it would require additional support from the City and its public agencies.

City as a Partner
The Historic Market Square in San Antonio precedent study emphasized the role of the city as a partner for supporting outdoor market events by activating the market square with events and performances that helps in attracting visitors to the market. The events along with activating the market square also improve the economic feasibility of the businesses operating in the market.

People Space over Parking Space
During the pandemic, due to social distancing and work from home guidelines, fewer people were driving leaving surface parking and parking lots underutilized. The pandemic gave several restaurants and eateries located adjacent to the parking lots an opportunity to improvise or expand public seating outdoors as highlighted in the case studies. This in turn created a vibrant social framework on the street parking surfaces and parking lots which emphasize the significance of creating people’s space over parking space.

All-Inclusive Public Space
The study suggests creation of an all-inclusive space is critical for the operational success of a culturally diverse outdoor market. This may mean creating markets that support certain cultural groups and their needs. While outdoor markets by nature suggest an all inclusive public space, lack of safety, accessibility and familiarity about the event could potentially exclude people from engaging in the market. This could have both social and economic implications as fewer people would be willing to participate thereby making it less feasible for the businesses, specifically diverse and small businesses to operate in the markets.
CHAPTER 6

PROJECT DISCUSSION: OPPORTUNITIES + CHALLENGES

The Project Discussion outlines opportunities identified through our work as they apply to potential outdoor activity, markets, and placemaking. The chapter then considers opportunity sites identified through site analysis. These opportunities are juxtaposed against challenges synthesized from all preceding sections.

Chapter Outline:

- Opportunities
  - Opportunity Sites
- Challenges

Image by R2P of MAX light rail stop in Rosewood.
**OPPORTUNITIES**

**Timely - Grant Opportunities**

The interest in this topic is very timely and there are a variety of different organizations and government agencies supporting these efforts. While conducting this project we were made aware of available grant opportunities through the Portland Bureau of Transportation for continuing to support these efforts.

**Timely - Outdoor Season**

Also, on the topic of timeliness—We learned throughout case study research that summer is often a time where people are more likely to engage in outdoor economic activity and with the weather improving businesses may be more willing to invest in outdoor space or engage with the city in a pilot project.

**Community Actors to Support**

There are many people who are engaged in important work that could be supported by the City. We interviewed several community markets, including the Come Thru Market that serve BIPOC vendors who may be interested in support from the City and could help mobilize or connect the City to people interested in working in East Portland. Additionally, organizations such as We All Rise are already working with businesses in East Portland to improve outdoor space and helping them navigate challenges such as insurance and working with their landlords if they are renters.

**OPPORTUNITY SITES**

The team used GIS, business cataloguing and visual analysis techniques to analyze the physical characteristics of different sites in both Rosewood and the Jade District to better understand barriers to implement outdoor commercial activity, but also look for places where there could be an opportunity for activity. The team considered both the opportunity for existing brick and mortar businesses to utilize parking lots adjacent to their buildings, but also thought about how other parking lots that may serve the function of temporary or permanent marketplaces where micro-enterprise and the DIY community could participate. We should mention that we found no “perfect site” and that implementing this type of program will require additional support from BPS and other agencies in the City. Some of the sites that we identified as points of interest for a pilot program or further exploration include:

**MAP 10. PARKING SPACES TO PEOPLE PLACES: OPPORTUNITY SITES**
**Address:** 16126 SE Stark

**Neighborhood:** Rosewood

**Owner:** Private: N&S Oil LLC

**Notes:** A large parking lot; houses the Rosewood Initiative and Su Casa Grocer.

**Address:** 5 NE 148th Ave

**Neighborhood:** Rosewood

**Owner:** Public: Trimet

**Notes:** Empty paved lot; adjacent to the Max line.

**Address:** 16110 E Burnside

**Neighborhood:** Rosewood

**Owner:** Nonprofit: Outside In

**Notes:** Empty private lot; scale is good; adjacent to the MAX line.

**Address:** 2305 SE 82nd Ave

**Neighborhood:** Jade District

**Owner:** Public: Portland Community College

**Notes:** Site for APANO’s Night Market; large empty parking lot when not in use.

**Address:** 7979 SE Powell Blvd

**Neighborhood:** Jade District

**Owner:** Private: Powell Street LLC

**Notes:** Large business node anchored by WinCo

**Address:** 9226 SE Division (Division Plaza)

**Neighborhood:** Jade District

**Owner:** Private: Division Oil

**Notes:** The Jade District hosts numerous small plazas particularly on SE Division with restaurants and businesses that could be explored.
CHALLENGES

Complexity of Regulatory Process
Throughout this process it became evident that in order to implement an outdoor project a business would need to interface with multiple city—and potentially state—agencies as well as insurance companies, landlords, and neighbors. This creates added layers of complexity both for the business but also those for BPS in terms of providing support. For BPS, this makes it hard to simplify and streamline costs and administrative work, since they only have jurisdiction over the planning process and other agencies or stakeholders may not be as supportive of the projects.

Physical Infrastructure Lacking
Physical infrastructure is lacking in East Portland and the City may run the risk of encouraging businesses to invest in economic activity that might not be viable. We heard from multiple market organizers that access to foot traffic is essential for their businesses. During our existing condition analysis we noticed that foot traffic was limited and walkability was unpleasant if not unsafe. This also presents challenges for BPS since investments may be costly and will also require coordination with agencies including but not limited to PBOT and the Oregon Departments of Transportation (ODOT).

Safety
Safety was something that was brought up often as an issue identified in East Portland for the businesses to conduct outdoor commercial activity. Safety is one of the reported issues with the Healthy Businesses permit program with many businesses experiencing theft of property (or vandalism) after making investments to the outdoor seating and placemaking. Concerns for safety is a huge challenge for businesses and participating communities alike, and BPS will have to consider overcoming this barrier in a more strategic way when planning for outdoor markets or events.

Lack of Capacity or Interest
Lack of capacity from community organizations or interest from vendors to put on markets, was evident during the community outreach conversation. Even as we come out of the pandemic, community organizations find it difficult to engage volunteers for the temporary events. This along with other barriers such as social distancing concerns or restrictions on gathering size capacity may deter people including business owners and vendors from participating in the markets.
CHAPTER 7

RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter overviews key strategies the project team recommends toward advancing the opportunities identified while lowering discovered barriers. They are organized based on their ability to fulfill the project’s objectives (from Chapter 1).

**Chapter Outline:**
- Theme 1: Further Engagement with the Community
- Theme 2: Community Capacity Building
- Theme 3: Robust and Navigable Support
THEME 1: FURTHER ENGAGEMENT WITH THE COMMUNITY

Goal 1.A: BUILD RELATIONSHIPS FIRST. Community-supported and community-led placemaking requires robust collaboration between City agencies like BPS and communities themselves. In order to build trust and momentum in East Portland to improve placemaking and access to existing or adapted City initiatives, BPS must continue to work to develop better relationships—beyond a few community leaders.

- Action Item 1.A.1: ESTABLISH A CONSISTENT POINT OF CONTACT. BPS could consider the utilization of existing staff resources or developing/utilizing a Community Service Aide (CSA) position to directly connect with community members, answer questions, and guide the permitting and regulatory process specifically for temporary events such as business extensions and outdoor markets. This action should include the empowerment of the employee to participate in relationship and capacity building activities including the attending of community events, speaking with community members, and training and assisting them on the sometimes difficult permitting and regulatory process.

Goal 1.B: ENGAGE WITH COMMUNITIES TO UNDERSTAND THEIR NEEDS AND DESIRES. In relation to the goal above, broader engagement with residents of East Portland regarding overarching visions, needs, and desires for their neighborhoods and centers is necessary. As described in the PAALF People’s Plan: East Portland Pilot, placemaking can be utilized as a transformative tool for communities at risk of displacement (see Policy Alignment + Existing Planning Efforts in this report); it can help residents build capacity and resilience against its occurrence. As such, a major goal is richer and more robust qualitative conversations with residents in order that they may co-create—more than just spaces—the actual solutions they need to the problems they face, whether those solutions be outdoor business space or otherwise.

- Action Item 1.B.1: CONTEXT-SPECIFIC ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY. BPS should consider working with community-representative skilled participation practitioners and community organizers to establish a more robust engagement process specific to the East Portland context that begins with establishing relationships—as discussed above—in the community. This action should include the utilization of flexible strategies that center communities as experts in their own lives. This could emerge as a guiding engagement strategy for the agency.
**THEME 2: COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING**

**Goal 2.A: CAPACITY AND STEWARDSHIP BUILDING.** A major barrier to the success of outdoor marketspaces, business extension, or community gathering places is the need for broader community capacity and resources for organizing stewardship and management of spaces. While community buy-in is integral to the success of placemaking projects, a broader City effort to integrate a stewardship model or strategy into its operations could help tremendously toward the utilization of programming and permitting opportunities by groups who are interested—but have limited capacity, time, or resources.

- **Action Item 2.A.1: DEVELOP A CITY-RUN STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.** While this action item is broad, City support of the management of these spaces through the creation of a specific division would help ensure long-term sustainability. This work could also be contracted with community groups and members in order to help provide low-barrier job opportunities for area residents.

- **Action Item 2.A.2: INVEST DIRECTLY IN COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS.** BPS should redirect existing City funds or seek broader funding opportunities in order to give CBOs money directly to use at their discretion with the least possible prescription. This could begin as small-scale funding for community partners to envision and deliver their own improvements and customized spaces, similar to PBOT’s grant funding for outdoor spaces as part of its Healthy Businesses permit program. City agencies and partner nonprofits should be available to provide technical assistance when needed, but should defer to the abilities, interests, and visions of those communities.

- **Action Item 2.A.3: PROVIDE BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.** BPS should work with Prosper Portland and localized organizations to provide access to education and assistance regarding budgeting, organizing, and bookkeeping processes, website development, and other software needs. This approach could help community organizations (formal or otherwise) with limited financial resources who are interested in operating community markets.

- **Action Item 2.A.4: DEVELOP A SAFETY AND SECURITY GUIDE.** A guide for interested parties on the navigation of challenges they might encounter within these spaces should focus on non-police alternatives. This guide could build upon or work with Pause Before You Call, a guide to non-police responses for distribution among area businesses. This is especially relevant given the disparate treatment of communities of color in Portland at the hands of traditional law enforcement.

**Goal 2.B: TARGETED PLACEMAKING.** It was clear through our community engagement process that walkability—and accessibility—is important to successful outdoor economic activity. BPS should utilize a combination of community engagement and coordination with other City agencies to plan projects to improve the pedestrian experience and activate the streetscape within areas otherwise lacking.

- **ACTION ITEM 2.B.1: IDENTIFY PRIORITY PROJECTS AND SITES.** Combining the robust community engagement recommended under Theme 1 and coordination with PBOT on planned projects could lead to the identification of opportunity sites and key projects to improve neighborhood access to destinations while attracting the broader public to these spaces. This list of priority projects and adjacent areas of opportunity could be compiled into a list and/or an ArcGIS shapefile. The list could be shared with interested stakeholders seeking spaces for placemaking.

**Goal 2.C: SUPPORT TEMPORARY MARKETS.** In consideration of low-barrier opportunities for business startups and commercial capacity building, temporary markets absolutely serve a role. The City has acknowledged this in Policy 6.71 of the Comprehensive Plan.

- **Action Item 2.C.1: DEVELOP MARKET STRATEGY.** The navigation of this process is obviously difficult. BPS could utilize a model similar to those utilized by local farmers markets and other pop-ups to create a strategy of support for emerging businesses, makers, and merchants who have products to sell but lack the space.

**Goal 2.D: REDISTRIBUTION OF POWER.** Many East Portlanders are renters—and a large majority of those living in this project’s geographies are. Few of the businesses we looked at own the land or buildings on or in which they operate. In addition, the district lacks effective or representative political representation. BPS, and the City more broadly, should consider ways to support the increase of political and organizational capacity of East Portland businesses and residents more broadly.

- **Action Item 2.D.1: PROVIDE LAND TO THE COMMUNITY.** The direct provision of underutilized land through donation to a community-based group in East Portland would help toward this goal. This approach would give these community members direct access to capital in land while offering them the freedom to decide how to plan, organize, and create a place for community use—whether market or otherwise.

- **Action Item 2.D.2: SUPPORT RESTRUCTURING OF CITY GOVERNMENT.** While perhaps out of the immediate purview of BPS, the support of a shift to a geographically representative, direct democracy is necessary to improve power and representation for East Portland residents. The centering of equity and racial justice within City government and all City agencies should include the commitment to support structural and institutional shifts necessary to achieve those goals.
THEME 3: ROBUST + NAVIGABLE SUPPORT

Goal 3.A: LOWER BARRIERS TO MATERIALS AND MAINTENANCE. In order to ensure broad access to potential placemaking or low-barrier commercial spaces, the support of communities in materials and maintenance needs should be expanded.

- **Action Item 3.A.1: PROVIDE QUICK-BUILD MATERIALS**: BPS should coordinate with PBOT and other agencies on partnering for quick-build project material provision and storage in order to assist those interested in something like the Healthy Business Program but lack utilizable space in the right-of-way. If coordination is not possible due to siloing of funding, BPS should create its own process to provide these materials. This step could include information on various agency websites in order to direct interested businesses or groups to the correct guide or contact.

- **Action Item 3.A.2: SUPPLEMENTAL MAINTENANCE SERVICES**: Beyond broad stewardship, facility maintenance and garbage, recycling and restroom services are integral to place success. BPS could coordinate services for refuse collection and maintenance for restroom facilities—like portable toilets for events and locations. This coordination could also include support for the delivery and pick-up of these and the above materials.

- **Action Item 3.A.3: CREATE PERMANENT DESIGN ASSISTANCE PARTNERSHIPS**: PBOT has partnered with the Center for Public Interest Design (CPID) at Portland State University, where CPID connects Healthy Businesses permit-holders to free professional design services with partnering private firms in the area. Utilizing a similar model or one inspired by this, BPS could partner with CPID or various student-led architecture and urban design workshops at the university to provide regular design assistance to interested organizations, businesses, or groups. In addition, the City could host repair events in East Portland to help businesses fix equipment and materials.

Goal 3.B: STREAMLINE AND IMPROVE ACCESS TO INFORMATION ABOUT PERMITS AND PROCESS.

Many of the markets we spoke with through the community engagement process described a complicated and fragmented process required in creating and operating spaces outdoors. Due to the complexity of legal requirements, bureau control or oversight based on location—public, private, or right of way—and more, the streamlining of the process and improved access to consolidated information would prove useful.

- **Action Item 3.B.1: CREATE A COMMUNITY LIBRARY FOR TOOLS AND TEMPORARY EVENT MATERIALS**: The development of or the coordination with other City agencies to create a space where items needed for events could be borrowed, rented affordably, or sold cheaply would help reduce many barriers to programming. PBOT has already worked, as mentioned in 3.A.1, in this realm. The City could find a way to collect donated materials and enhance reuse and business-to-business sharing.

- **Action Item 3.B.2: CURATE EASY NAVIGATION AND GUIDANCE FOR OUTDOOR BUSINESS USE**: The City should work through interagency coordination to create a one-stop-shop for the process to help individuals and groups navigate the complexities of grants, materials, processes, permits, and insurance. This could exist as a toolkit and resources list that could be available digitally or distributed physically as needed. While the development of this guide would be time-consuming, its unrolling could align with the point of contact in Action Item 1.A.1. This guide could be created in tandem with an interagency short-range strategy for low-barrier economic development through temporary pop-ups and community markets to ensure that City staff respond consistently and coordinate effectively.

- **Action Item 3.B.3: ENSURE TRANSLATION AND ACCESSIBILITY OF GUIDANCE TO BROAD AND DIVERSE AUDIENCE**: The above or any supplemental—or separate—resources should be translated into the languages residents need in navigating the process. Beyond language, people with disabilities and people who do not have consistent access to digital resources should also be considered when developing any guidance.

- **Action Item 3.B.4: REDUCE OR ELIMINATE PERMIT FEES AND COVER INSURANCE COSTS**: This action could utilize need-based assessment criteria for those interested but unable to cover the costs that become barriers to these opportunities. PBOT has considered this approach in its Healthy Business Program; the variations of requirements based on location and regulations are apparent, so this could be a broader pool of funding to be utilized for such purposes.
CHAPTER 8

PROJECT LIMITATIONS

The project was ambitious in its timeline and scope to address the disparities highlighted by the Healthy Businesses permit program to create human centric spaces for outdoor commercial activities and beyond. This combined with the exploratory nature created limitations that are listed below. These limitations were difficult to navigate but by no means limited our capacity to research, engage and investigate the project to the best of our capabilities.

**Broad Scope**
The project scope was broad and we had challenges executing all of the deliverables we set out to do including initiating or exploring a pilot project. Our attempt to be thorough and robust did not fully take into consideration the current capacity of community partners, ourselves, and even City agencies well over a year into an exhausting global public health crisis.

**Short Academic Timeline**
Time proved to be a big limitation in our outreach efforts, thorough engagement requires a lot of it, especially now.

Lack of time felt a big barrier in the understanding and holistic completion of the project.
The team felt rushed and nervous we may miss something important to the goals of the project.

**Lack of Process Knowledge for Market Organizing**
In consideration of interesting cases/practices, many of them focus less on process and more on result. Deciphering how to get from point A to point B is incredibly difficult, given the timeframe, capacity of this group and the general limitations of desk research.

**Capacity of Businesses to Engage**
Our inability to get in touch with businesses or business vendors points to the likelihood that many business owners/vendors lack the time and/or resources to interact with a project of these sorts.

**Inability to do Robust Community Engagement**
A project of this kind requires robust community engagement, time and direction in terms of connecting with community members and businesses that are specifically underserved and difficult to reach. The complexity of this project and the diversity of the stakeholders, would require a multi pronged community engagement program that does not render itself to a one-size-fits-all solution. Our inability to connect with businesses, specifically small and home-based businesses proved to be a barrier in our understanding of needs and requirements from a business or a vendor perspective.

The short time frame of this project, combined with the general inability to physically walk up to businesses created a huge barrier in setting up those much needed conversations.

We struggled with gaining timely access to translation services and even assessing what types of resources would be needed in the community.
APPENDICES

Appendices document the project methodology; a detailed overview of the demographic conditions of East Portland; the site selection methodology and maps; supplemental maps related to the project and planning process; a list of businesses and maps in Rosewood; and the engagement plan, interview summaries, and call logs from the engagement process.

Chapter Outline:

• Appendix A. Project Methodology
• Appendix B. “The Numbers” by the Numbers
• Appendix C. Site Selection Methodology
• Appendix D. Supplemental Maps
  • Study Areas Zoning Maps
  • Project Geography Selection Supplemental Maps
• Appendix E. Business Lists + Maps
• Appendix F. Engagement Plan, Interview Guide + Summaries
The Right to Place Collaborative consultant team in collaboration with the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability as the client undertook the Parking Spaces to People Places project to explore the understanding of encouraging the use of underutilized parking lots that are existing in outer East Portland, the most racially diverse area of the city and the state. The capstone workshop project was undertaken by a team of six Master's of Urban and Regional Planning graduate students for a period of approximately six months to explore the need and possibilities of outdoor markets and community events on public or privately owned parking lots. Initialized with an RFP from the client, the project was further developed and ironed out by the consultant team to arrive at a manageable work plan. The initial phase of the work plan included Memorandum of Understanding and Scope of Work developed by the consultant team in coordination with the client and input from the PSU workshop faculty team. The SOW document informed the project background, description, and project tasks while. The MOU consisted of key details such as the team members’ roles within the project, project key phases and the general timeline of the project.

The second and the most rigorous part of the work plan included project research in terms of desk research and community outreach via interviews. The project entails several key research components such as existing conditions and site selection analysis, as well as further analysis of the selected sites. These steps in the process inform the opportunities, challenges and barriers to outdoor events that are directly related to the East Portland geography.

To develop a deeper understanding of the needs, possibilities, interests, and challenges within the community for outdoor markets and events the consultant team conducted interviews of community partners and market organizers via virtual platform to help keep the community safe during the pandemic. Further, the team also conducted interviews with employees of public agencies to investigate further details about permitting, insurance and other regulatory requirements from a City.

The R2P collaborative looked at some interesting practices within and outside the City and the county to explore the possibilities of outdoor markets from a diverse viewpoint, investigating markets that serve a diverse population; are easily accessible and most importantly successful in attracting people from different walks of life.

The final stretch of the project entails analysis, recommendations and take-aways from the research that would serve as a reference report for agencies, community business and market organizers intending to operate outdoor markets or events within their communities, particularly when utilizing the underutilized parking lots in East Portland.
APPENDIX B: "THE NUMBERS" BY THE NUMBERS

As the boundaries of East Portland served by the East Portland Community Office do not align with the boundaries of Census Tracts, R2P has followed the lead of the Portland Bureau of Transportation in its survey of East Portland for the East Portland in Motion Plan in tracts used.

In the analysis in this report, data was pulled at the tract level—where sample data can be analyzed at a statistically significant scale. Utilizing the U.S. Census American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates, R2P utilized the same Census Tracts used by the Portland Bureau of Transportation in its East Portland in Motion East Portland Demographic Overview. Of the 38 tracts that overlap with the boundaries of East Portland, the following six have been excluded:

- 222.03 and 222.04, because they are in Clackamas County and are geographically mostly in Happy Valley (and not in Portland);
- 98.03 and 99.03, which are geographically most in Gresham or unincorporated Pleasant Valley;
- and tracts 73 and 102, which include large sections from NE 33rd Avenue to Troutdale.

As a result, the following tracts have been utilized:

- 6.01
- 6.02
- 6.02
- 16.02
- 17.02
- 29.03
- 77
- 78
- 79
- 80.01
- 80.02
- 81
- 82.01
- 82.02
- 83.01
- 83.02
- 84

East Portland is the most racially and ethnically diverse district in the city; a full third of its residents identify as being members of BIPOC communities. The district has become more diverse in the past decade, growing 3.9% in BIPOC population shares; it is also growing more diverse racially and ethnically than Portland as a whole—and is doing so more quickly (Table B1).

Of particular interest is a reduction in the percentage of population share in Portland city of Black/African American residents despite a population growth in both East Portland and the city at large of Black residents during that time-period. While this could point to continued gentrification and displacement, it might also be partially the result of the increase in other populations of color relative to the Black population growth—particularly Hispanic/Latinx and Asian groups (Table B1).
### Table B1. Population by Race/Ethnicity, East Portland vs. Portland, 2009-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Portland</th>
<th>Portland City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>152,783</td>
<td>548,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>175,194</td>
<td>645,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td>22,411</td>
<td>96,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Alone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>107,323</td>
<td>432,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>116,332</td>
<td>499,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td>9,009</td>
<td>66,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black, Indigenous and People of Color (BIPOC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>45,460</td>
<td>116,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>58,862</td>
<td>145,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td>13,402</td>
<td>29,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black/African American</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11,137</td>
<td>35,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>13,885</td>
<td>37,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>2,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic/Latinx</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>19,683</td>
<td>48,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>25,343</td>
<td>62,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>14,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Indian/Alaska Native</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,909</td>
<td>6,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>5,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td>-921</td>
<td>-1,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>16,480</td>
<td>35,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>25,419</td>
<td>52,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td>8,939</td>
<td>17,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>2,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2,592</td>
<td>3,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>1,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Some Other Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7,268</td>
<td>14,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>6,014</td>
<td>12,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td>-1,254</td>
<td>-2,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two or More Races</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6,673</td>
<td>22,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>8,964</td>
<td>34,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>12,354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2004-09 and 2014-19), re by R2P.*
East Portland also has a greater proportion of households speaking languages other than English. The most prominent languages other than English spoken in the district are Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Russian and other Slavic languages. East Portland is also more densely populated than Portland city overall, with a population density of 6033.6/square mile versus Portland's 4,836.3/square mile. The district has also grown more dense during the past decade. (Table B2).

**TABLE B2. POPULATION DENSITY OF EAST PORTLAND VS. PORTLAND (PER SQUARE MILE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Portland</th>
<th>Portland City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5,259/square mile</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>6,033/square mile</td>
<td>4,836.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).

East Portland Median Household Income (MHI) remains lower than in Portland; in fact, the disparity between the MHI has increased significantly in the past decade, with East Portland’s MHI being nearly 25% lower than Portland’s. Of particular noteworthiness (though not in the table) is the 2019 MHI for Black/African American East Portlanders: $34,013 (in 2021$), less than half that of white Portlanders at large.

**TABLE B3. MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME (MHI), EAST PORTLAND VS. PORTLAND, 2009-2019 (IN 2021 $)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Portland</th>
<th>Portland City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$51,722</td>
<td>$58,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$54,155</td>
<td>$71,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).

Poverty rates are also higher in East Portland than in Portland city. 18.8% of East Portland residents had income below the poverty level in 2019, compared to 13.7% of the City as a whole (Table B4). The concentration of poverty in East Portland is in part the result of pre-pandemic job growth in the high- and low-end of pay and “skill” requirements in the region, contributing to this growing income inequality. This persistent, disparate poverty rate is higher than most of Portland’s peer cities and is marked by increasing concentrations within East Portland.

**TABLE B4. POVERTY STATUS, EAST PORTLAND VS. PORTLAND, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Portland</th>
<th>Portland City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32,498</td>
<td>86,793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).

East Portland residents are slightly more likely than Portland as a whole to own their homes (Table B5). However, that is likely due to lower property values and lower costs of living overall in that district. It is important to note, though, that property values have exploded in recent years East of 82nd Avenue—growing faster than those in Portland as a whole. As such, R2P predicts that this percentage will likely decrease in the coming years.

**TABLE B5. TENURE OF UNITS (%), EAST PORTLAND VS. PORTLAND, 2009-2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Portland</th>
<th>Portland City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table by R2P with data from American Community Survey (ACS) 5 Year Estimates (2014-19).

East Portland residents are also more likely to lack a High School degree (or equivalent). Educational attainment in degrees of Bachelors or higher are much lower in East Portland than in Portland city (Table B6). Most striking is that advanced degrees (Master’s, Professional, or Doctorate) are attained by over 20% of Portland city residents over 25, compared to only 7.3% in East Portland.
In consideration of healthcare access, East Portland residents are more likely to lack health insurance. This is an important consideration for access to healthcare services, particularly during a global pandemic. While 8.9% of East Portland residents lacking health insurance may seem like a low share, it means that over 13,500 community members in that district lack access to reliable care. On top of this, access to either public or private insurance is not indicative of access to reliable, affordable healthcare: Oregon Health Plan, Oregon's Medicaid program, has grown significantly in recent years while being plagued with low provider participation. While private insurance numbers have also increased in the years after the passage of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), increasing premiums and deductibles have left even insured individuals unable to afford adequate care.

However, these numbers and the aforementioned information still do not paint a full picture of the experiences of all groups in East Portland, they make abundantly clear that two very different Portlands exist and continue to grow more disparate as time passes. Even with attempts to address gentrification, displacement, and inequitable distribution of infrastructure, services, access, mobility, and more, public assistance and planning have failed to make a marked improvement on the area.
APPENDIX C: SITE SELECTION METHODOLOGY

East Portland is also the largest geographic district in the City;\textsuperscript{62} due to the limitations in scope of this project primarily resulting from time and resource constraints, R2P utilized a two-pronged approach to focus on two smaller project geographies within the district:

- The first prong focused on the centering of community outreach and conversations with community-based organizations (CBOs) identified by BPS and existing conditions/outreach research to explore community interest, capacity, and needs; through that process, R2P explored one project geography identified through this snowball approach to engagement that also overlaps a “center” as identified in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan (Map C1). The other contender, due to our outreach, was Parkrose. While we did not select Parkrose explicitly, we did facilitate conversations with Historic Parkrose that are also outlined in the Public Engagement section of this report. Either location would have been an excellent option for the geography, and choosing was difficult.

- Second, R2P selected another geography utilizing the Portland Plan’s Investment Strategy for Complete Centers (Figure C1), which utilizes the same centers identified within the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, and the following criteria:
  1. The center has both been identified within the Investment Strategy for Complete Centers as high need and containing a high number of BIPOC, low-income, and/or Limited English Proficiency Households;\textsuperscript{63}
  2. The center is at high risk for gentrification or contains a high number of households at risk of displacement as defined by the City of Portland and Dr. Lisa Bates in the Gentrification and Displacement Typology Assessment;\textsuperscript{64}
  3. The center lacks physical and community amenities associated with complete centers in existing City plans.

Given the reality of gentrification and displacement and their effects on populations of color in East Portland, R2P decided to explore separate geographies for the following reasons:

- The team is centering one geography based on community and business interest, capacity, and needs where CBOs or businesses may have already expressed interest in these adaptations while still needing assistance navigating barriers in the process;
- In centering equity more holistically, the team feels it must also consider community needs and interests in a second geographic area that takes into account historic planning wrongs while honing in on communities most underserved by previous and current plans, projects, and policies;
- Because East Portland is so diverse in demographics and in space, the success of this project hinges upon the understanding that diverse communities have diverse experiences, needs, and interests; as such, they likely face different barriers. While we cannot seek to understand them all in the scope of this project, we can at the very least explore two geographies to better tailor project recommendations and model solutions.
From the Report: “Circle sizes correspond to center types: Central City (largest), Gateway Regional Center, Town Centers, and then Neighborhood Centers (smallest).

**Darker (or green) circles** indicate that a center includes higher than average concentrations of vulnerable residents, such as renters, communities of color, households with low-median incomes and/or low education levels.”

Figure from The Portland Plan Progress Report, 2017.
Criterion 1
The center has both been identified within the Investment Strategy for Complete Centers as high need and contains a high number of BIPOC, low-income, and/or Limited English Proficiency Households.

As can be seen through comparison of Map CI and Figure CI, every single center in East Portland is considered “higher need” by the strategy. Those with higher populations by 2035 that are also indicated by higher than average concentrations of “vulnerable residents” include the Jade District, Hazelwood, Lents, Rosewood, and Gateway.

For each of the indicators considered in the criterion—R2P produced a choropleth map of East Portland with centers outlined and labeled; the only exception is Limited English Proficiency (LEP) households, for which a map already existed: PBOT’s Equity Matrix. In that case, R2P visually analyzed the existing map. All of the created maps and a screenshot of the Equity Matrix map utilized are available in Appendix D: Supplemental Maps.

Notably, many centers contained high percentages of BIPOC population shares. For low-income households, the centers with the highest percentages of households under 80% MFI include all centers except Parkrose. As for LEP households, essentially all centers overlap tracts with at least twice the citywide average.

Criterion 2
The center is at high risk for gentrification or contains a high number of households at risk of displacement as defined by the City of Portland in the Gentrification and Displacement Typology Assessment.

In the development of the Gentrification and Displacement Typology Assessment, BPS created a vulnerability index considering the following variables of census tracts as being indicative of gentrification and displacement risk: higher concentrations of BIPOC population shares; higher concentrations of households under 80% MFI; higher concentrations of households without a Bachelor’s degree or higher; and percent of renter households. These indicators were combined to create a vulnerability index. R2P created a map of this Vulnerability Index with outlines of centers (Map C2). Those tracts with higher concentrations of these variables are in a choropleth—the darker the green, the higher the number of vulnerability indicators (1-4). The typology is based on the research of Dr. Lisa Bates, conducted under contract with the City in 2013.

MAP C2. VULNERABILITY INDEX FROM GENTRIFICATION AND DISPLACEMENT TYPOLOGY ASSESSMENT AND CENTERS IN EAST PORTLAND

The results are similar to Criterion 1. All centers have tracts overlapping with areas that rank 4, or highest on the Vulnerability Index.
Criterion 3
The center lacks physical and community amenities associated with complete centers in existing City plans.

In order to visualize this consideration, R2P utilized another existing City dataset, the Complete Neighborhood Overlay, in order to consider physical and community amenities. This layer is a GIS overlay that measures “completeness” of areas in the city based on their proximity to various amenities, including: grocery stores; parks and recreation facilities; commercial services; elementary schools; pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure; and frequent transit. Areas where a minimum of five of these indicators are present are shaded (Map C3). Center labels have been removed from this map in order to ensure visibility of the overlay within their boundaries.

The combination of this overlay and the Vulnerability Index makes clear that there are many deficiencies in amenities that make complete centers in East Portland. Of the centers that are the least complete—Parkrose, Rosewood, and Division and 162nd—the center with the most overlap in tracts with the highest number of Vulnerability indicators becomes clear: Rosewood.
APPENDIX D: SUPPLEMENTAL MAPS

Study Area Zoning Maps

MAP D1. JADE DISTRICT STUDY AREA AND CENTER ZONING

Map by R2P with datasets from the City of Portland’s Portland Maps Open Data website.

MAP D2. ROSEWOOD STUDY AREA AND CENTER ZONING

Map by R2P with datasets from the City of Portland’s Portland Maps Open Data website.
Project Geography Selection Supplemental Maps

MAP D3. EAST PORTLAND BIPOC POPULATION SHARES BY TRACT, 2017

Map by R2P with datasets from the City of Portland’s Portland Maps Open Data website.

MAP D4. EAST PORTLAND SHARES OF HOUSEHOLDS AT OR BELOW 80% MFI BY TRACT, 2017

Map by R2P with datasets from the City of Portland’s Portland Maps Open Data website.
MAP D5. PORTLAND LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY HOUSEHOLD (LEP) SHARES BY TRACT, 2016
(SCREENSHOT OF PBOT EQUITY MATRIX + DEMOGRAPHIC INDICATORS LEP TAB)

Map from PBOT Equity Matrix + Demographic Indicators.

**Percentage of limited English proficiency (LEP) households**

- 25.0%
- 6.2%
- 3.8% citywide average
- 3.0%
- 1.6%
- 0.7%
- 0.0%

Source: 2012-2016 American Community Survey
APPENDIX E: BUSINESS LISTS + MAPS

In an attempt to help with community engagement efforts and to better understand the neighborhood, R2P used google maps to make a record of all of the businesses in Rosewood. Instead of using census block data to find the boundary of the neighborhood (as done in the rest of the report), we used the boundary as defined by the CBO, Rosewood Initiative. We recorded as much information as possible including type of business, contact information, parking lot conditions, independent or chain, and minority owned businesses.

The map is active on Google My Maps:

https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/1/edit?mid=1e5wYMoeQdXZELoXRvdgJQfnbYsleNwl6&usp=sharing

IMAGE E1. PREVIEW OF ACTIVE MAP OF ROSEWOOD BUSINESSES IN GOOGLE MY MAPS

MAP E1. ROSEWOOD BUSINESSES

Map by R2P with data from Google Maps.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Business Type</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Independence</th>
<th>Minority Owned</th>
<th>Parking Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: ENGAGEMENT PLAN, INTERVIEW GUIDE+SUMMARIES

Purpose of the Outreach Plan

The Purpose of the Outreach Plan is to help us identify the steps the team will take to conduct community in
teragency outreach as defined in the SOW. The purpose of community outreach is to get qualitative information
from stakeholders about interest in using parking lots for outdoor marketplaces and identifying areas for poten
tial projects. The team will also use the information to gather information on the opportunities and constraints
to implement these projects. The team will also try to work with hard to reach populations to better incorporate
equity into the project phase.

Two Phases

The team will conduct outreach in two phases. The first phase will be focused on information gathering, ori
enting ourselves with different programs and projects occurring in our study areas, identifying potential partners
for a project, and helping us better define the strategy and tactics needed to implement Phase 2 of outreach.
Phase 2 of outreach may evolve based on the findings of Phase 1, including gauging interest from the community
in a project(s) and based on our identification of final deliverables in accordance with the SOW. This phase may
focus on furthering our understanding of opportunities and barriers, identifying businesses to talk to and who
may be interested in a pilot project. Because the work will rely heavily on interviewing, the team will develop an
interview guide.

Covid 19

The neighborhoods we are focusing on have been the hardest hit by the COVID pandemic and to the extent
possible outreach will be done using virtual methods or over the phone based to prevent the possibility of disease
spread. Should the team identify inperson outreach needs the team will discuss ways that may be accomplished
that minimize contact and disease risk.

Equity

Careful consideration will be given to make sure that interviews and other touch points of the community include
the voices of BIPOC, different age groups, people with different immigraions status, and different socio-econo
mic information are included in the analysis. The stories of these groups may come directly from the commu
nity or key informants may be able to provide some context into the community. The team will work with CBOs
already working in the area to manage engagement fatigue and identify businesses and residents who we can
talk to. As stated in the Scope of Work the team will also be prioritizing in depth qualitative information and using
quantitative data gathered as a means to support the research process. The team will also encourage BPS to
provide funding to individuals or businesses who would be willing to participate in an interview. The team has
also coordinated with BPS to obtain interpretation services if needed.

Community Outreach Team

Ann Le (Outreach Lead) Is responsible for moving the outreach process forward and developing recommenda
tions for Phase 2 of outreach including ways to improve equity. Will be the lead for communicating the outreach
process to BPS in meetings.

Arva Hussain (Outreach Support) Provide backup support for Ann which may include scheduling meetings and
making recommendations for improving outreach processes. As the main contact for clients will follow up on
names/dates/contacts and support.

Elizabeth Cox (Writing Lead) Will lead/assist with document development and summarizing key outreach
findings based on aggregating meeting summaries.

Rest of the team (Meeting & Analysis Support) Will staff meetings as needed/interested and will provide input on
outreach findings.
Phase 1 (Mid-March through Mid-April):

Goals:

Finalize a second geography to focus on based on interest from CBOs (as defined in the SOW)

Gather information about potential partner organizations to implement a pilot project and/or assist with Phase 2 of community outreach

Gather information about existing efforts to implement similar or tangential projects; this will include reaching out to other market places, and government agencies and CBOs engaging in similar or tangential work.

Gather initial information about opportunities and barriers with an equity focus for implementing different public space projects in East Portland

Build out our stakeholder list and identify interview subjects for Phase 2 of outreach; identify needs from BPS for financial support.

Tactics:

The primary tactic will be interviews with government agencies and community organizations with an emphasis on those that work with BIPOC communities.

This will include interviews with the NBIs in Park Rose and Jade District/Apano who have apparently expressed interest in a potential project based on feedback from BPS.

The team will develop open-ended meeting questions and an interview guide that allow information to be gathered but encourage the participants to identify gaps and help us map out how to move forward with deliverables and projects.

Utilize a snowball approach to identifying additional stakeholders and people to talk to about potential projects, interest, opportunities and barriers

Take notes at each meeting and/or record (if possible), and develop a meeting summary to synthesize information

Key meetings to be conducted:

- PBOT; Center for Public Interest Design; Four lead NBIs - Parkrose, Division-Midway, Rosewood, Apano / Jade District; Neighborhood prosperity network

Phase 2 (April-May):

Goals:

- Further explore opportunities and barriers to repurposing parking space for public space and begin to make recommendations based on the findings.

- Gather information that could help empower BIPOC communities including gaining a better understanding of resource and support needs.

- Gain further insight into what a pilot project might look like; this include looking for a site.

- Tactics will be further developed after the initial phase of outreach but potential ideas could include:
  - Partner with a CBO to talk to potential businesses and residents to explore the possibility of a pilot project
  - In-depth qualitative interviews with businesses, community groups and residents to get more information about opportunities and constraints, and ways the city can support East Portland.
  - Focus groups with businesses in East Portland to help us better understand interest, barriers and opportunities.
Interviews with CBOs in the Portland NPI Network

Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon / APANO (Jade): APANO focuses on community organizing, policy advocacy, civic engagement, leadership development, community development, and cultural work in the Jade District. The CBO has been involved in local projects to encourage development/neighborhood improvement projects while fighting gentrification and displacement. The organization has held numerous community events in the area with the largest (and maybe most well-known) event the annual Jade Night Market.

APANO has strong community ties due to extensive work in economic development, neighborhood improvement projects, and land banking. The CBO is well established and has access to resources that some of the smaller CBOs may struggle with. When asked about challenges the CBO might face when organizing outdoor events, the existing street infrastructure in East Portland seemed to be the biggest problem. Compared to inner Portland, Jade District has much longer blocks with limited street parking, lots of dead end streets, and poor street connectivity. Commercial activity is centered around Powell Boulevard and 82nd Street, and businesses are clustered in oddly-shaped plazas. Many of these plazas have limited access to their parking lots (sometimes just one shared entrance/exit point). Traffic circulation could be a concern if events were to be held in these small plazas. Outside of street infrastructure challenges, event staffing and language support for the diverse community in Jade were also concerns for organizing a successful event.

Historic Parkrose (Parkrose): Historic Parkrose focuses on economic and business development for businesses in Parkrose, and there is a mutually beneficial relationship with many of the local businesses. Prior to local restrictions due to the pandemic, the CBO held frequent community events. The interviewee emphasized that the events were about collaboration and community, not about making profit. The past events went well thanks to community donation of time and resources.

While Historic Parkrose has assets such as existing good relationships with businesses and community members and experience in organizing outdoor events in the past, many challenges were brought up during the interview. It is small compared to other CBOs in the NPI network, and the theme of most of the challenges brought up during the interview seemed to be lack of resources and/or access to resources. The CBO shared that, at the time of the interview, it was organizing its first pop-up outdoor market event during the pandemic. There was excitement around the upcoming event but also concern about holding an event with residents still wary about covid-19. Events are for people to socialize and creating a safe place for people to do that during a pandemic is extremely challenging. The CBO also shared struggles with limited resources (staffing, event equipment, money for liability insurance – not limited to just the upcoming event). On top of regular event insurance that could be costly on its own, event organizers might have to pay more for covid-19 related insurance. The CBO also shared that navigating city processes around holding events was challenging. The permitting process can be complicated, staff had limited knowledge of resources already available from the city, and staff had limited experience in event planning tasks such as traffic control, site planning, and managing attendees. Access to space is also challenging for many event organizers. There are hurdles to go through for using publicly-owned spaces as well as privately-owned spaces.

Rosewood Initiative (Rosewood): Rosewood Initiative is mainly focused on economic development work in Rosewood. It connects community members to resources such as grants to cover for needed business expenses or neighborhood projects. The CBO has already been thinking about how to use parking lots as community gathering spaces. The Rosewood Initiative office is located on a parcel of land with a large parking lot that has been used for events such as Rosewood Night Out, movies in the parking lot, and bake sales.

Rosewood Initiative is well-connected in its community. Its diverse staff members are often community leaders that are brought into the organization. Many of the staff members have worked with the City permitting system for years and have lots of institutional knowledge. The organization as a whole is usually well-aware of where to find resources. Like the other CBOs, Rosewood Initiative brought up lacking street infrastructure and access to resources as barriers to organizing outdoor events. Rosewood has diverse communities with different needs including access to materials in uncommonly offered languages. Access to funding was historically a challenge to the neighborhood. Many of the barriers were related to the existing street infrastructure in Rosewood. The streets are busy – noise and air pollution and wide streets with fast-moving traffic pose health and safety hazards. There is limited public transit access compared to inner Portland. Rosewood also (at least the part of it within East Portland limits) has limited open space. Its private parking lots can be used for outdoor events, but most parking lots aren’t ideal gathering spaces. There is limited tree coverage (not pleasant to spend time on hot pavement with no overhead protection) and safety concerns due to drivers cutting through parking lots at unsafe speeds.
Interviews with Market Organizers

**Come Thru:** Come Thru Market is a farmers market focused on centering Black and indigenous farmers and makers. We interviewed the market organizer who emphasized that the market offered more than just space for vendors to sell their products. They offer small business support and coaching as well. The interviewee shared that during the pandemic, it was somewhat easier to access resources for events. However, there is concern about what happens when the resources are no longer available. How will organizations and people dependent on temporary pandemic financial support fare when those resources start to disappear?

The market is currently held in Inner East Portland, but the market organizer provided great insights on general challenges for outdoor market and event organizers. There is tension in how people feel about space being used for the general public and for private uses. Covid-19 has created a scarcity in available space for outdoor events to operate out of. Private property owners want to utilize their land for profit – it is extremely challenging for a farmers market (or similar event) organizer to use parking lots/open space when the events aren’t as profitable as a food cart pod. Come Thru Market currently operates on land on loan from EcoTrust – the land would otherwise cost up to $5000/day to use. The interviewee also shared other common challenges. Insurance is expensive for events (even more so during the pandemic). Regulatory processes are barriers for many people. Access to information is an issue for event organizers because of the disorganization of permitting and other related information on City sites. The interviewee noted a lack of technical support from the City. People are sometimes unsure of what questions to ask to get the resources they need; many people are unfamiliar with the technical language used on City sites.

There are also challenges specific to organizing a market. It is a taxing job with relatively low pay. The interviewee shared that they sometimes worked 12 hour days and that the average market organizer pay is just $17/hr. A market takes months of planning; navigating the permitting process, choosing vendors equitably, supporting vendors requires careful consideration and time. There is a lot of work involved in managing the success of vendors. Food vendors do well at frequent events, but vendors (such as ones that sell craft/artisanal products) may do better at once a month events. There is also market frequency to consider. A one-time market versus a series/on-going market requires different approaches. As a market grows in scale, there are additional costs such as software to manage vendors to consider. A one-time event can be handled through emails and spreadsheets. A longer event requires software to help track vendors.

**NAYA:** NAYA is a pop-up market with a physical retail space hosted by the Native American Youth and Family Center. The market is relatively new and has rotating vendors. Covid-19 restrictions have limited the number of in-person vendors at the space. Vendors are typically from the Portland metro area although some are native vendors from other parts of Oregon such as La Grande or Yakima. This market differs from the other two in that it is operating out of an indoor space, however, the market organizer has previous experience with outdoor events that serve the local native community.

The market has been growing in popularity and has received positive feedback. About 75% of the guests are non-native identifying. The market hopes to connect with the local community while giving opportunities to support indigenous businesses in a new way. The market has a unique challenge in that its vendors are not used to selling their products in a retail space. Many of these vendors sell and participate in powwows which is a very different setting than a retail space. The interviewee stated that the interest in selling at pop-up markets has always existed within the community, but covid-19 has pushed people to come up with new ways to sell their products.

The interviewee shared some familiar challenges to operating the pop-up market and events in general. There is a demand for more opportunities because of covid-19 health concerns and restrictions. People want to support more small businesses despite rapidly changing restrictions. Some of the biggest challenges shared were the complexities in navigating the permit system. Information is not easily accessible in one place. For example, it is not clear what to do if someone wants to host an event at a non-traditional event space. It is also challenging to build community capacity (especially during the pandemic). Events rely on volunteers to help out and on people to come out of their homes to shop. It is important that people feel a connection to the event to want to volunteer or engage.

**Montavilla:** Montavilla Farmers Market serves the Montavilla neighborhood in providing fresh local food and more. It is a community market rather than a market geared towards selling to tourists. Many of the market founders still live in Montavilla and shop there. We interviewed with the market manager who shared their experience with the market and thoughts on existing barriers to outdoor events. The market started in 2007 and is now open twice a month. It is now established within the community, but it is facing some threat due to the possibility of the site being developed. The market organizers are unsure of the future of the market at its current location. Location is extremely important for the success of a market. It’s best to hold the market in a commonly used community gathering space or near a busy street for visibility. Access to parking and transit lines is also important.
Montavilla continued...

Many of the challenges brought up during the interview are similar to the ones from the Come Thru Market interview. City and county processes are confusing. Organizers need to be familiar with how to acquire permits for vendors, propane use, noise (for live music), street closures, and more. The Montavilla Market offers an SNAP funds matching program which requires market staff to go through the County to process EBT cards. Balancing the need for the market to be economically viable while being able to afford a market organizer, event equipment, and paying for programs such as its SNAP matching or reduced fees for beginning farmers is also challenging. The interviewee noted a lack of markets in East Portland but was not sure of the reasons why. They felt it could be that there is a disconnect between people able to finance markets and a willingness to go into East Portland communities and find out their needs. The issue could also be the lack of suitable sites for farmers markets in East Portland.

Interview with Consultant Firm

We All Rise: We All Rise focuses on reinventing spaces in Portland neighborhoods to support business owners of color. The consultant firm started as a volunteer effort to help PBOT engage with community members for the Healthy Businesses permit program. The firm supports and partners with private entities to create outdoor public spaces. The interviewee felt that public spaces are hard to make; it is much easier to create a private space as there are less regulations. Parks require expensive insurance and permits.

The firm has experience and connections with different communities on the idea of outdoor commercial. It partnered with APANO to engage with East Portlanders about the Healthy Businesses program. Some of the challenges in limited community buy-in to the program were challenges shared by other interviewees. The street infrastructure in East Portland is lacking – there are major safety concerns around the wide, busy streets and the lack of sidewalks in some neighborhoods. The interviewee also brought up access to funding. There is lots of funding available from different City agencies, but not all community members are aware of available resources or where to find them. There is a lack of meaningful connection between the City and community organizations. Inadequate design support and general support for community members wanting to change their neighborhoods also posed a barrier. Everything requires money which isn’t easy to get. The interview ended on thoughts about how the City should fund grassroots activism instead of being prescriptive with its various grants.
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